DENVER SEMINARY LIBRARY
BR162 .N6 v.1 MAIN
Newman, Albert Henr/A manual of church h
3 2482 00052 9893

LEWAN LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER
DENVER SEMINARY
6399 SOUTH SANTA FE DRIVE
LITTLETON, CO 80120

LEWAN LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER
DENVER SEMINARY
6399 SOUTH SANTA FE DRIVE
LITTLETON, CO 80120

A MANUAL OF CHURCH HISTORY

BR
162
N6

A Manual of Church History

BY

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D. D., LL. D.

Professor of Church History in Baylor University
Department Editor of Church History for New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia
Author of "A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States"
"A History of Anti-Pedobaptism," etc.

Volume I

Ancient and Mediæval Church History

(To A. D. 1517)

3170

The American Baptist Publication Society
1701-1703 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia

Copyright 1899 by the
AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY

Published January, 1904

From the Society's own Press

Printed in U. S. A.

TO

Dr. Albert Hauck

Professor in the University of Leipzig,
Geh. Kirchenrath, Editor of the "Real-Encyklopädie"
and Author of the great "Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands" that
has recently been awarded the Verdun Prize, the highest distinction
that a work on German History can receive

AND

Dr. Johann Loserth

Professor in the University of Graz, the highest authority on
Wycliffite, Hussite, and Anabaptist literature and
history, to whose writings and friendly
offices the author is under profound obligation

THIS VOLUME IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/manualofchurchhi0000albe_r9l3

PREFACE

THIS work is the product of over twenty years of almost continuous application on the author's part to the study and teaching of church history. It has been his constant endeavor in every part of the volume to incorporate the best results of recent research, and to furnish to his readers information at once trustworthy, impartial, and fairly adequate on every topic discussed.

While the work has grown out of the author's own needs and experiences as a teacher, and is primarily intended as a text-book for theological seminaries and universities, he believes that it is equally adapted to the requirements of ministers of the gospel and of intelligent laymen throughout our great Baptist constituency. As he has conscientiously striven to record the facts as he has found them, without distorting them in the slightest degree in favor of any particular view of history, or any peculiar tenets of his denomination, he sees no reason why the work should not be acceptable and useful to members of other denominations as well as to those of his own. The recognition given to the author's fair-mindedness and freedom from partisanship by leading scholars of other denominations who have reviewed his earlier works induces the hope that this also will find a large number of sympathetic readers in the various bodies of evangelical Christians.

It has long been the conviction of the author that a place should be given to church history in the *curricula* of all colleges and universities. A number of leading American universities have followed those of England and Germany in giving to the history of the Christian religion a place side by side with Greek and Roman history and philosophy, mediæval and modern political history, constitutional history, the philosophy of history, the history of philosophy, comparative religion, sociology, etc., as fundamental to the effective study of humanity. If, as is unquestionably true, Christianity has been a chief factor in the production of all that is best in modern civilization, its history should be relegated to no subordinate place among the instruments of general culture. It is little creditable to the Christian colleges and universities of the United States that this important department of study has been to so large an extent neglected.

A text-book on this subject, scientifically prepared and free from partisanship, should encourage professors of history to include the history of Christianity in the courses they offer, and it is the author's earnest desire that this work may contribute in some small measure to the more extended study and the better understanding of the greatest movement in human history.

The bibliographies interspersed through the volume, and which it is believed will add greatly to its value, are meant to be neither absolutely inclusive of the literature actually used in its preparation, nor absolutely exclusive of what has not been so used.

To Rev. Joseph Leeming Gilmour, B. D., of Hamilton Ont., one of the most scholarly of our younger ministers, the author is indebted for valuable assistance in the preparation of the Index.

The second volume, completing the work, is in course of preparation and will be published, it is hoped, before the close of next year.

A. H. N.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY,
TORONTO, CANADA, October, 18[illegible]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION.—OBSERVATIONS ON THE STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY, AND PREPARATION FOR CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY 1–64

CHAPTER I.—PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS ON THE STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY 3–19

- Definition and Scope of Church History 3
- Historiography, Objective and Subjective 5
- Sources of Church History 9
- The Employment of Sources 11
- History of Church Historiography 12
- Periods of Church History 16
- Summary of Reasons for Studying Church History. 17

CHAPTER II.—THE GRÆCO-ROMAN CIVILIZATION AS A PREPARATION FOR CHRISTIANITY 20–33

- Greek Civilization 20
- Greek Philosophy 21
- The Macedonian Conquest 27
- The Roman Empire 29

CHAPTER III.—PREPARATION FOR CHRISTIANITY IN JEWISH LIFE AND THOUGHT 34–64

- The Effects of the Babylonian Captivity. 35
- Influence of the Persian Contact 36
- The Jewish People under the Macedonian Rulers . 39
- The Maccabean Struggle 44
- Rise of Religious Parties 47
- The Dispersion 55
- The Jewish-Alexandrian Philosophy—Philo Judæus 59
- Messianic Expectations. 62

PERIOD I.—FROM THE BIRTH OF CHRIST TO THE END OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE (*c.* A. D. 100) . 65–143

CHAPTER I.—JESUS THE CHRIST 67–80
The Fullness of the Time. 67
The Pre-Incarnate Word 68
From Conception to Baptism 68
The Baptism, the Temptation, and the Testimony of John the Baptist 70
The Public Ministry of Jesus 71
Some Estimates of the Character and Influence of Jesus 78

CHAPTER II.—THE APOSTLES. 81–124
The Apostolic Church to the Conversion of Saul . 81
From the Conversion of Saul to the Jerusalem Conference 88
From the Jerusalem Conference to the Neronian Persecution 92
From the Neronian Persecution to the Death of the Apostle John 111

CHAPTER III.—CONSTITUTION OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCHES. 125–143
The Church and the Churches 125
Officers of the Apostolic Churches 131
Ordinances of the Apostolic Churches 135
Worship—Elements, Times, and Places 140
Methods of Christian Propagandism 142

PERIOD II.—FROM THE END OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE TO THE CONVERSION OF CONSTANTINE (A. D. 312) 145–301

CHAPTER I.—RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO THE ROMAN EMPIRE FROM THE TIME OF THE APOSTLES TILL THE ADOPTION OF CHRISTIANITY AS THE RELIGION OF THE EMPIRE 147–172
General Observations 147
Causes of Persecution 148
Treatment of Christians by Different Emperors . 150

CHAPTER II.—INTERNAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY DURING THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES 173–210
General Observations 173
Heretical Sects: Ebionites, Gnostics, Manichæans, Monarchians. 174
Reactionary and Reforming Parties: Montanists, Novatianists, Donatists 202

CHAPTER III.—THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE OF THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES 211–290
Preliminary Observations 211
The Edificatory Period, or the Period of the Apostolic Fathers 213
The Apologetical Period 237
The Polemical Period 246
The Scientific Period 271

CHAPTER IV.—CONDITION OF CHRISTIANITY AT THE CLOSE OF THE PERIOD 291–301
External Condition. 291
Internal Condition 292

PERIOD III.—FROM THE CONVERSION OF CONSTANTINE TO THE FOUNDING OF THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE BY CHARLEMAGNE (A. D. 800) . 303–434

CHAPTER I.—CHURCH AND STATE 305–319
Constantine and his Successors 305
The State Church 311

CHAPTER II.—CONTROVERSIES IN THE CHURCH . . 320–392
On Ecclesiastical Polity—the Donatist Controversy 320
On the Relations of the Godhead—the Arian Controversy 323
The Origenistic Controversies 332
On Christology—the Nestorian, Eutychian, Monothelite, and Adoptionist Controversies . . . 335
On Anthropology—The Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian Controversies 358

Chap on [illegible] 11 class

Controversies Occasioned by Protests Against the Progressive Paganization of Christian Life as seen in Asceticism, the Veneration of Saints and Relics, etc.—the Aërian, Jovinianist, Vigilantian, Paulician, and Iconoclastic Controversies . 371

CHAPTER III.—THE RISE AND GROWTH OF THE PAPAL POWER 393–422

Preliminary Observations 393
Leo the Great and the Papacy 397
The Pontificate of Gelasius 400
The Pontificate of Symmachus 401
Hormisdas 402
Justinian and the Papacy 402
The Merovingian Kingdom and the Church . . . 404
The Pontificate of Gregory the Great 405
The Carlovingian Kingdom and the Papacy . . . 406
The Christianity of Britain in Relation to the Papacy 409
The Advancement of Papal Dominion through Missionary Endeavor: Augustine, Willibrord, and Boniface 415

CHAPTER IV.—THE CHRISTIAN WORLD AT THE CLOSE OF THE PERIOD 423–434

The East and the West 423
Literature and Learning 428
Church Discipline 429
Mohammedanism as a Rival of Christianity . . . 431

PERIOD IV.—FROM THE CORONATION OF CHARLEMAGNE AS ROMAN EMPEROR TO THE OUTBREAK OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION (A. D. 800–1517) 435–621

CHAPTER I.—SOME ASPECTS OF MEDIÆVAL CIVILIZATION 437–494

Preliminary Observations 437
The Holy Roman Empire 439
Feudalism 443
Canon Law and Forged Decretals 447

The Roman Curia 449
Mediæval Monasticism 451
The Crusades 456
The Inquisition 463
Mediæval Universities 469
Mediæval Theology—Scholasticism, Mysticism . 474
The Renaissance 490

CHAPTER II. — THE PAPACY DURING THE MIDDLE AGES 495-540
The Popes from A. D. 800-1044 495
The Hildebrandine Scheme of Reform 502
The Controversy on Investiture and the Concordat of Worms (1122) 509
The Hohenstaufen Emperors and the Popes . . . 511
Decline of the Papal Power: Boniface VIII., Papal Captivity, Papal Schism, Reforming Councils 518
The Popes of the Renaissance 535

CHAPTER III.—REACTIONARY AND REFORMING PARTIES 541-621
Preliminary Observations 541
Dualistic Dissent: Bogomiles, Cathari 543
Chiliastic and Enthusiastic Sects: Joachim of Floris and the Joachimites, Spirituales 551
Pantheistic Heresy: Amalric of Bena, Beghards and Beguines, Brethren of the Free Spirit . . . 555
Evangelical Separatism: Petrobrusians and Henricians, Arnold of Brescia, Humiliati, Tanchelm, Eudo, Waldenses, Taborites, Marsilius of Padua, Peter Chelcicky, Lollards, Bohemian Brethren 557
Evangelical Churchly Reformers: Wycliffe, Huss, Brethren of the Common Life, "Reformers before the Reformation" 600

INTRODUCTION

OBSERVATIONS ON THE STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY, AND PREPARATION FOR CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS ON THE STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY

LITERATURE: Sections on Church History in the Theological Encyclopedias of Räbiger (English translation), Hagenbach (English translation, with additions by Crooks and Hurst), Zöckler's "*Handbuch der Theol. Wissenschaften*," Cave's "Introduction to the Study of Theology," Drummond's "The Study of Theology," and Schaff's "Propaedeutics"; Introductions to the Church Histories of Schaff, Gieseler, Hurst, Moeller, Niedner, Kurtz, Döllinger, Alzog, Hergenröther, Funk, and Kraus; Fisher, J. A., "Bibliography of Church History," 1885; Dowling, "Introduction to the Critical Study of Ecclesiastical History," 1838; Smyth, E. C., "Value of the Study of Church History in Ministerial Education," 1874; Smith, H. B., "Nature and Worth of the Science of Church History" (in "Faith and Philosophy," 1877); De Witt, "Church History as a Science, as a Theological Discipline, and as a Mode of the Gospel" (in "Bibliotheca Sacra," 1883); McGiffert, "The Historical Study of Christianity" (in "Bibliotheca Sacra," 1893); Stanley, "Lectures on the Study of Ecclesiastical History" (in "History of the Eastern Church," 1872, Introduction); Bright, "The Study of Church History" (in "Waymarks of Church History," 1894).

I. DEFINITION AND SCOPE OF CHURCH HISTORY.

HISTORY in its broadest sense is the setting forth in literary or oral form of the development in time of the divine plan of the universe, in so far as this development has become an object of human knowledge. This definition involves a recognition of the fact that the universe was planned and created and has been continuously sustained and ordered by an infinite God. Human history would include a narration of all that is known of the origin of mankind and of the development of human nature in all its aspects and under all circumstances. Sacred history is the setting forth of the known facts of man's development as it has been affected by the providential, inspiring, and self-revealing presence of God.

Church history is the narration of all that is known of the founding and the development of the ~~kingdom of Christ~~ on earth. The term church history is commonly used to designate not merely the record of the organized Christian life of our era, but also the record of the career of the Christian religion itself. It includes within its sphere the indirect influences that Christianity has exerted on social, ethical, æsthetic, legal, economic, and political life and thought throughout the world, no less than its direct religious influences.

The history of Christianity has much in common with the history of other systems of religion, and much that is peculiar. Religion is a universal factor in human life. The religious life of every organized people has a history of its own. Each of the great world-religions has had its origin, its growth, its influence on the social, ethical, and political life of the peoples that have professed it, has undergone changes by virtue of the influence of the other elements of life and thought by which it has been surrounded, has been modified by contact with other systems of religion and philosophy, has developed forms of worship, sacred rites, sacred books, sacred persons and classes, sacred places, methods of propagating itself, and theories of the origin and development of the race and of the goal of human history. The religion of Jesus Christ entered upon its career amid Jewish surroundings. Jesus himself as a man was consciously a member of the Jewish community. His early disciples were all thoroughly imbued with the principles of Judaism. By special divine grace a select few were marvelously preserved from the contamination of error. But as Christianity made its way throughout the Jewish and pagan world it was inevitable that it should be profoundly influenced by the current modes of thought and life and that its polity, doctrines, ordinances, worship, ethical conceptions, and ideals of life, should be assimilated in some measure to those of the world in which it had its being. It may be said in general, that just in proportion as the Christianity of any age and land has submitted to the worldly influences that have been brought to bear upon it has its development approximated that of heathen religions.

In the above definition of church history it is presupposed that the human race is in an abnormal state, alienated from God, and that the end of Christianity is the restoration of man to a condition of obedience to God and communion with him. The history of the church should show, therefore, the progressive accomplishment of this divine purpose through the centuries, taking full account of the obstacles that have presented themselves to the triumph of Christianity and the means by which they have been surmounted.

AIM

II. HISTORIOGRAPHY, OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE.

As the aim of the church historian should be to ascertain and to represent the exact facts in their relations to each other and to the times and circumstances concerned in each case, it is manifestly desirable that in the process of investigation he should deal as impartially with his materials as does the chemist with his specimens. The end and aim of all his research should be the accurate ascertainment of facts in order that truth may emerge. It is incumbent on him to guard scrupulously against allowing his judgment to be swayed by the supposed bearing of the facts on the traditions of his denomination or his own individual opinions.

On the other hand, it is neither practicable nor desirable that the church historian should be indifferent to the subject-matter of his science or that he should be so destitute of convictions as to form no moral judgments on the opinions and acts of parties and individuals whose history he studies and seeks to expound. As a matter of fact, the great mass of those who are in a position to devote their lives to research in church history have been so conditioned by reason of their known convictions and ideals. It is not the scholar who is without personal interest in Christianity and who studies its history in a purely scientific spirit, that is likely to enter into the fullest appreciation of the facts of church history; but the scholar who is most profoundly imbued with the spirit of Christianity, rejoices in all that is Christlike and heroic, laments the corruptions and perversions of the past, and is most deeply concerned for the honor and purity of the Christianity of the present and the future. Christ is the truth. The church historian must be above all things truthful and truth-loving. That any one who claims to be a follower of Christ should seek to advance the cause of Christ by the suppression of facts or by the suggestion of falsehood is so anomalous as to be incredible were not undoubted instances, ancient and modern, so numerous. The truth-loving church historian will seek to be as scrupulously just to individuals and parties from whom he fundamentally differs as to those with whom he fundamentally agrees. He will be as reluctant to credit disparaging statements against the former, when insufficiently supported by evidence, as to discredit such statements against the latter without adequate reason. The prevalent practice in the past has been to credit every statement that bears against one's opponents and to discredit every statement unfavorable to one's friends. The following points of view may be here discriminated :

1. The Romanist, maintaining that all authority, that of the Scriptures included, inheres in the church ; that the church has the right to legislate independently of Scripture ; that as vicar of Christ on earth the pope possesses of right universal dominion, spiritual and secular, will of necessity study and write church history from a hierarchical point of view. Convinced that "the greater glory of God" is involved in the realization of the aims of the hierarchy, he will regard everything as praiseworthy and justifiable that has ministered to the upbuilding of hierarchical power and that the church has approved, and everything as heretical and worthy of reprobation that has opposed the development of the hierarchical scheme. It is evident that the Romanist, as such, is disqualified from treating objectively the facts of church history. He is not even able to view the facts subjectively as conforming or not conforming to the standard set up by his own personal moral judgment. The standard is an objective one, fixed by church authority.

2. The Anglo-Catholic, accepting as supreme the authority of the ancient undivided church as represented by the Fathers of the first six centuries or more specifically by the canons of the first four General Councils, and laying the utmost stress on apostolic succession, church perpetuity, and catholicity, as marks of the church, will inevitably write church history with a view to establishing the identity of his own church with the church of the Fathers, and the historical derivation of its episcopate from that of the early church, and so from the apostles. It were not to be expected that he would deal sympathetically or fairly with Christian individuals or parties who do not bear his "marks" of churchmanship.

3. The advocates of ecclesiastical development, holding that Christ and his apostles did not design to prescribe or exemplify a definite form of church organization that should be perpetually binding, but that the Christian life which embodied itself in a particular form of organization suggested by and adapted to the needs and circumstances of the apostolic time may assume a thousand other forms, under as many varying circumstances, will attach comparatively little importance to changes in ecclesiastical order and in doctrine from age to age. He will show, *e. g.*, by reference to the circumstances and needs of the times, how and why the simple congregational order of the primitive churches gave way first to presbyterial government, then to simple episcopal, then to prelatical, and at last to papal. He will regard each stage as the natural, if not necessary, outgrowth of antecedents and environments, and while he will not hesitate to condemn corrupt practices, he will be slow to condemn any ecclesiastical institution as such. Freed from the necessity of defending any particular form of Christianity as exclusively valid, he will be in a position to treat sympathetically, with reference to the circumstances of their times, even the most corrupted and distorted forms of Christianity, and especially will he be interested in all efforts, however misguided, to bring about reforms. Such is the position of the great mass of modern German students of church history, and it is among these that we find the closest approximation to true objectivity of treatment combined with deep interest

in every form of Christian life, organization, and doctrine. English Broad Churchmen occupy essentially the same position, but have not busied themselves largely with church history.

4. He that sees in the precepts and example of Christ and his apostles, as embodied in the New Testament Scriptures, an authoritative standard for all times and all circumstances, will look upon any deviation from this standard as obnoxious to the spirit of Christianity. While admitting that apostolic church order is given only in outline, and that much has been left open and free for determination from time to time by the wisdom of bodies of believers organized in the apostolic way, practising apostolic ordinances, and subject continually to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, he will refuse to give his approval to any violation of what he regards as the fundamental principles embodied in the apostolic norm. Yet in view of the speedy and almost complete departure of the post-apostolic churches from the apostolic church order, and of the fact that thenceforward to the present time so large a part of the Christian work that has transformed the world has been accomplished by churches and individuals whose church order, doctrines, and manner of life have fallen indefinitely short of the apostolic requirement, he will judge as charitably as possible those who do not appear to have been willful perverters, but who may be supposed to have been led astray by early training or the force of circumstances, and will rejoice in all that is Christlike and noble in life, in thought, and in deed. While he will be ever alert to discover the existence and to trace the history of individuals and parties that in times of general apostasy have earnestly attempted to restore the apostolic form of Christian teaching and practice, he will guard scrupulously against perverting the facts in this interest; and while he may strongly suspect that if the facts were all known, apostolically organized churches and apostolic types of teaching and life would cut a far larger figure in certain periods than appears from materials at present available, he will be content to state precisely what he finds authentically recorded, and to give his reasons for thinking that the facts may have been more favorable than the extant

documents reveal. The church historian who feels bound in his own life, doctrine, and practice by the apostolic norm should be the most truth-loving, the most charitable, the most fair-minded, the most unpartisan of all. He should be able to exemplify the very best sort of objectivity in his investigation and exposition of the facts of church history. Knowing that truth is mighty and must ultimately prevail, he will believe that a statement of the exact facts in each case will better subserve the cause of truth than any partial or distorted narrative could possibly do.

III. SOURCES OF CHURCH HISTORY.

These embrace all the contemporary information on Christian life, thought, organization, and achievement in each age and country, extant in written or other form. The following specifications may be made:

1. *Contemporary Christian literature of every kind.* (1) Edificatory writings show the ideals of Christian life that prevailed, the evils that had to be guarded against, the methods of using and interpreting the Scriptures, and the current types of teaching. (2) Apologetical literature shows the attitude of the church of each age toward the world and of the world toward the church, and usually embodies the philosophical conceptions that underlie the Christian thinking of the time. (3) Polemical literature reveals the antagonistic forces at work in each age among professing Christians, and while it often gives evidence of the presence of intolerance and partisan rancor and shows little appreciation of the position of opponents, it is exceedingly valuable as furnishing the materials for the history of doctrinal development. (4) The canons of synods and councils and the collections of rules and regulations for the guidance of the churches in matters of discipline belonging to each age and country, throw much light on the practical working of organized Christianity. (5) Creeds, usually formulated as a result of controversy and generally embodying either compromise statements or the opinions of the dominant party, have their obvious uses as materials for church history. (6) Liturgies and hymns produced by and for the

churches of each age and country embody the prevailing ideals of worship and reflect the religious life of the times. (7) Correspondence, public and private, embodying in many cases the frank expression of the opinions of leading actors on current events, is often of the highest value. (8) Papal decretals, rescripts, bulls, briefs, etc., present in concrete form the claims of the hierarchy from time to time, and the methods employed for securing recognition of hierarchical authority. (9) Imperial and royal edicts, capitularies, and other enactments in relation to ecclesiastical matters, have their obvious uses. In fact, civil and ecclesiastical history are so intimately related, especially since the union of Church and State, that most civil records have a bearing direct or indirect on church history. The *Corpus Juris Civilis* is almost as important for church history as the later *Corpus Juris Canonici*.

2. *Christian Archæology*. Religious sculpture and painting, symbolical representations of religious acts and truths (as on the walls of the catacombs and on gems), inscriptions on coins and seals, remnants of church architecture, baptisteries, etc., are embodiments, each in its way, of the religious life and thought of their age, and are worthy of the attention of the church historian.

Abundant materials of all the varieties specified have been preserved, and through the industry of scholars have been made available to the student in printed form. The work of research is still going energetically forward, and it is probable that within a few years little extant material of value will have remained in concealment.

Treatises on church history, ancient and modern, are of value only so far as they are known to rest upon a critical and judicial use of the original sources.

The materials of church history are now so vast that no individual can hope to master them. The best work appears at present not in general treatises on the entire subject, but in monographs on limited periods, particular movements, particular institutions, individual leaders, etc. The general church historian must depend very largely on such monographs prepared by specialists; but he will be careful to test their results on all important matters by direct reference to the sources.

IV. THE EMPLOYMENT OF SOURCES.

1. It is obvious that if sources are to be used the languages in which they are written must be thoroughly mastered. The sources of ancient church history are mostly in the Greek and Latin languages, a knowledge of which is indispensable. Some valuable material exists in the Syriac, Ethiopic, Coptic, Armenian, and the various Slavonic languages, but few church historians undertake the mastery of these. For the church history of Western Europe during the Middle Ages, Latin is the principal language; but important writings are preserved in the primitive forms of the German, the Romance, the English, and other languages. For modern history the German, French, Dutch, and Italian languages are important, especially the first two.

2. The successful historical investigator must have critical insight in a high degree. A vast amount of spurious material is intermingled with the genuine literature of each age. He must be able to discriminate between the genuine and the spurious. Of genuine writings some are more trustworthy than others, owing to the character, the circumstances, and the competence of the writers. The investigator must be able to judge of the relative value of documents, and amid conflicting evidence to reach conclusions reasonably well assured.

3. Most church historians will find it convenient to make use of translations of the pertinent literature along with critically edited texts in the original languages. When translations are used for securing a general familiarity with the subject-matter, the originals should be carefully compared on all obscure and controverted points.

4. On matters of controversy we are to study carefully the documents on both sides. This is absolutely essential.

5. We are to distrust writers evidently prejudiced when they make grave accusations against opponents, unless there are other reasons for crediting such accusations. The average polemicist of ancient, medieval, and Reformation times had less regard for truth, when in the heat of controversy, than the polemicist of the nineteenth century.

6. On the other hand, admissions by partisan writers of shortcomings on their own side, or of merits on their adversaries' side, are among the best proofs of such facts, independently of the general credibility of the writers.

V. HISTORY OF CHURCH HISTORIOGRAPHY.

The Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles are the earliest extant writings in the sphere of church history, the former narrating from different points of view the birth, early life, ministry, death, and resurrection of the Messiah, the latter giving an account of the missionary labors of the apostles, especially of Peter and of Paul, including Paul's two years' residence as a prisoner in Rome. Passing on to the post-apostolic time we may distinguish the following eras of church-historical writing:

1. *Ancient Church Historians.* Hegesippus (about 175–189) wrote five books of "Memoirs," from which Eusebius quotes, but which are unfortunately lost. He seems to have given chief attention to the rise and growth of heresy, and to Jewish sects. Eusebius speaks of him as a converted Jew. 2 Eusebius of Cæsarea (260–340) is entitled to be called "the Father of Church History." One of the most learned men of his time and as the courtier of the Emperor Constantine possessed of every facility for gathering materials and composing a meritorious work, he prepared on a comprehensive plan a "Church History" that has held its position to the present time as the most important work on the ante-Nicene Church (1–324). The scholarly translation by McGiffert, with ample annotations,[1] is indispensable to the student of church history. He was a careful investigator, and quoted largely from many writings that have perished. That his work is uncritical and ill-arranged is a remark that would apply to all ancient and medieval treatises on the subject. His "Life of Constantine" is of the nature of a panegyric, and is too favorable to the first Christian emperor, but it contains much important matter. He also wrote a "Chronicle," in which he gave an abstract of universal history with chronological tables. In the follow-

---

[1] New York, 1890.

ing century Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, each in his own way, continued the Church History of Eusebius to his own time. These include accounts of the great Christological controversies, and of the struggle of Christianity with paganism during the fourth and part of the fifth centuries. Eusebius' work was translated into Latin by Rufinus, with a continuation to the death of Theodosius the Great (395). Cassiodorus, a Roman statesman, had the Church Histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret translated into Latin by Epiphanius, and himself continued the narrative to 518. This so-called "Tripartite History," along with that of Eusebius, formed the chief authority on ancient church history throughout the Middle Ages.

Sulpicius Severus, a Gallic noble and ascetic (died 420), wrote a "Chronicle," in which church history followed biblical history. His work abounds in the fabulous and is of little value. The works of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, like that of Eusebius, are available in excellent translations in the "Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers." Of less importance are the Church Histories of Theodorus and Evagrius (sixth century), which were continuations of those already mentioned.

2. *Mediæval Writers.* The Middle Ages produced nothing important on ancient church history. Contemporary chronicles, often preceded by a digest of early history from the Latin translations of the writings mentioned above, represent the achievements of the age in this department. Lives of the saints, full of fables, abounded. Several compilations of universal history were produced, but these are of little value.

3. *Church Historians of the Reformation Time.* The Protestant Revolution, which was a revolt against the corruptions and the tyranny of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, called forth the "Magdeburg Centuries" (1559–1574), written by Matthias Flacius Illyricus, Wigand, Judex, and others. It is a vast and monumental effort to vindicate the Protestant position by an exhibition of all that is most disreputable in the history of medieval Catholicism. Stress is laid upon the protests against Rome that were made from time to time, and much valuable material is brought forward by these scholarly and indus-

trious writers. The work is excessively polemical, but served a useful purpose. It called forth the learned and voluminous "Ecclesiastical Annals," edited by Baronius (1588), who had at his disposal the resources of the Vatican Library. Baronius' work, which embraced only the first twelve centuries, has been continued by various writers to 1585.

In France, Bossuet attempted to vindicate the Roman Catholic Church against Protestant attacks, and to destroy the foundations of Protestantism by his "Discourse on Universal History" (1681). The voluminous work of Tillemont, a Jansenist nobleman, on the first six centuries,[1] was based upon an industrious and somewhat critical study of the sources, and was written in a spirit of moderation. It is still of value.

An epoch-making book was the "History of the Church and of Heretics," by Gottfried Arnold (1699). Deeply pious and somewhat mystical, he used his great learning in an effort to show that what had commonly been stigmatized as heresy was really the effort of primitive Christian life and principles to assert themselves in the face of bitter persecution. His voluminous work was looked upon with disfavor by his contemporaries, but is now highly appreciated by impartial scholars.

4. *Recent Church Historians.* Mosheim (died 1755) is justly called "the father of modern ecclesiastical history."[2] His "Institutes of Ecclesiastical History" (1755) has been translated into English and widely used. He was learned, critical, and impartial, and did much toward popularizing the study of church history. He followed the century method, and in this respect belongs to the older time, but he surpassed most of his predecessors in philosophical insight and comprehensiveness of view. His most valuable work was probably his "Commentaries on the Affairs of Christians before Constantine the Great" (1753).

Three German writers of the first half of the present century deserve special mention, because of the intrinsic value of their works and the stimulus they gave to research on the part of others. They followed close upon the emancipation of thought from the old confessionalism and the remarkable development of the critical spirit about the beginning of the century, and in different ways exemplify the modern spirit of research and the determination to deal impartially with all religious parties.

---

[1] "Memoirs," etc., 1693, *seq.*

[2] Moeller.

Gieseler's "Text-book of Church History"[1] consists of a brief but very carefully prepared outline, with copious citations from the sources made with marked discrimination. It is still the best manual for such students as are able and willing to utilize the citations.

Neander, well characterized by Schaff as "a child in spirit, a giant in learning, and a saint in piety," "led back the study of history from the dry heath of rationalism to the fresh fountain of divine life in Christ, and made it a grand source of edification as well as instruction for readers of every creed." His "General History of the Christian Religion and Church" (1825–52) was translated into English by Torrey, and in this form reached its twelfth American edition (besides English and Scotch editions) in 1881. It has probably had a wider influence in English than in German. Besides this large general work he published many valuable monographs.

Baur, more generally known as the father of the Tübingen school of New Testament critics, was a church historian of the foremost rank. Of his "History of the Christian Church," published in part after his death (1860), only the portion covering the first three centuries has appeared in English (three volumes, London, 1878). His works on the apostolic age, while revolutionary and destructive, gave a stimulus to research that has borne abundant fruit. His "History of Christian Doctrine" (1865–67) is among the most valuable of his works.

Among the excellent manuals of church history recently published in Germany may be mentioned those of Hase (eleventh edition, 1886; English translation, 1873); Niedner (latest edition, 1866); Ebrard (1865); Rothe (1875); Herzog (1876 onward); Kurtz (tenth edition, 1887; English translation, 1888–90); Moeller (three volumes, 1889 onward; English translation, 1892 onward); and Karl Müller (two volumes, 1892 onward). The two latest are also the best. Among modern German Roman Catholic works on church history may be mentioned those of Alzog (English translation in three volumes, 1874 onward); Döllinger (second edition, 1843; English translation, four volumes, 1840–42); Hergenröther (third edition, 1884–86); Kraus (third edition, 1887); and Funk (second edition, 1890). These are all works of learning, and show the influence of Protestant methods.

---

[1] 1824 onward; the best edition is the English translation by H. B. Smith, 1857 onward

British scholarship has not devoted itself zealously to general church history. The only work that deserves mention is Robertson's "History of the Christian Church" (second edition, in eight volumes, 1874). Smith's "History of the Christian Church During the First Ten Centuries" (1880), is a good compilation. Many valuable monographs, especially on the early church and the Middle Ages, have appeared.

In America the largest and most comprehensive work is Schaff's "History of the Christian Church" (1882 onward; Vol. I.–IV. and VI.–VII. have appeared; Vol. V. was left incomplete, and will be edited by Prof. D. S. Schaff). This work, written in the spirit of Neander, combines fullness of information with popular qualities to a remarkable degree. Other recent works of merit are those of Sheldon (four volumes, 1896), Fisher, Dryer, and Hurst. Hurst's "History of the Christian Church" (two large volumes, 1897 onward), based upon the latest researches, written in excellent spirit and in elegant style, has an unusually full bibliography and specially prepared maps, and is in almost every respect a model work.

The best recent works on the "History of Doctrine" are those of Harnack (three volumes, third edition, 1894–1897, English translation in eight volumes); Loofs (third edition, 1893), the best brief work in German; Sheldon (1886); and Fisher (1896).

VI. PERIODS OF CHURCH HISTORY.

From what has been said regarding the nature and scope of church history, it is evident that the only way in which it can be studied to advantage is by dividing the nineteen Christian centuries into periods, and by selecting from each period a convenient number of topics for special consideration. The division into periods is somewhat arbitrary, and historians differ considerably in their delimitations. The following division seems, on the whole, the most advantageous:

1. From the birth of Christ to the end of the Apostolic Age (about 100).
2. From the end of the Apostolic Age to the conversion of Constantine (312).
3. From the conversion of Constantine to the founding of the Holy Roman Empire by Charlemagne (800).
4. From the coronation of Charlemagne as emperor to the outbreak of the Protestant Revolution (1517).
5. From the outbreak of the Protestant Revolution to the Peace of Westphalia (1648). This latter event almost synchronizes with the temporary overthrow of monarchy in England, and with the temporary ascendency of dissenting parties over the prelatical church.
6. The era of modern denominationalism (1648 to the present time).

The choice of topics in each period will depend on the judgment of the historian as to what features of the life and thought of the age are most characteristic and significant.

VII. SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR STUDYING CHURCH HISTORY.

1. History is acknowledged by all to be one of the most valuable instruments of intellectual culture. Church history is so essential a part of universal history that the history of humanity would be incomplete and unintelligible without it. Universal history is best understood when Christ is regarded as the central figure, for whose advent the past, with its systems of religion, philosophy, and government was, in an important sense, a preparation; and when Christ's church, under his guidance, is recognized as the aggressive and conquering power in modern history.

2. Without a knowledge of the history of the Christian church in all its departments and relations it is

impossible to understand the present condition of Christianity with its multitudinous sects, its complicated doctrinal systems, and its variegated forms of organization, life, and worship.

3. The history of the Christian church is, in one aspect, the history of Christian life. To know how the people of God have, from age to age, struggled and suffered and triumphed will tend to prepare us to meet the trials that always beset the Christian life; to know how large a proportion of those that have professed Christianity have lived in sin and dishonored the name of Christ will tend to put us on our guard against a similar failure, and to prevent us from despairing when we see how imperfectly many of those around us fulfill their Christian duties.

4. The study of church history enables us to see the working of great principles through long periods of time. Church history is a commentary on the Scriptures. For every teaching of Scripture we can find many a practical exemplification. We can show, as it were, experimentally, how every departure from New Testament principles has resulted in evil—the greater the departure the greater the evil. The study of church history, while it may make us charitable toward those in error by showing us examples in all ages of high types of religious life in connection with the most erroneous views of doctrine, will not tend to make us disregard slight doctrinal aberrations; for we shall know that the most corrupt forms of Christianity have had their origin in slight deviations from the truth.

5. It may be said with confidence that the great mass of minor sects have been formed by those ignorant of church history, and that a knowledge of church history on the part of their founders would have prevented their formation. A widely diffused knowledge of church history would tend powerfully toward a unification of thought as to what Christianity should be, and would be highly promotive of Christian unity. On the other hand, a knowledge of the vast results that have followed from the emphasizing of particular aspects of truth in the past would tend to prevent an underestimate of their importance in the present.

6. The history of the Christian church furnishes the

strongest possible evidence of the truth and assurance of the final triumph of Christianity. If Christianity has surmounted obstacles seemingly almost insuperable; if though sometimes submerged in corruption it has again and again shown itself able to shake off the accumulations of error, and then to march onward with primitive vigor; we have every reason to believe in its sufficiency for all the trials to which it may hereafter be subjected

CHAPTER II

THE GRÆCO-ROMAN CIVILIZATION AS A PREPARATION FOR CHRISTIANITY

LITERATURE: Histories of Greece, by Grote, Curtius, and Thirlwall; Histories of Rome, by Mommsen, Ihne, Merivale, Neibuhr, Bury, and Arnold; Döllinger, "*Heidenthum und Judenthum*" (English translation, "Gentile and Jew in the Courts of the Temple," 1862); Histories of Philosophy, by Ueberweg, Zeller, Windelband, Erdmann; Bauer, "*Das Christliche des Platonismus*," 1837; Ackerman, "The Christian Element in Plato" (English translation, 1861); Cocker, "Christianity and Greek Philosophy"; Westcott, "Religious Thought in the West," 1891; Hatch, "The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church," 1890; Mommsen, "The Roman Provinces" (English translation, 1888); Schiller, "*Gesch. d. Rom. Kaiserzeit unter d. Regierung d. Nero*," 1872: Friedländer, "*Sittengeschichte Roms*," fourth edition, 1874; Renan, "The Influence of Rome on Christianity," 1880; Fisher, G. P., "The Influence of the Old Roman Spirit and Religion on Latin Christianity" (in "Discussions in History and Theology," 1880); Harnack, "Christianity and Christians in the Court of the Roman Emperors Before the Time of Constantine" (in "Princeton Review," 1878); Addis, "Christianity and the Roman Empire," 1893; Arnold, W. T., "The Roman System of Provincial Administration," 1879; Farrar, "Seekers After God," new Edition, 1892; Uhlhorn, "Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism" (English translation. 1879), and "Christian Charity in the Ancient Church" (English translation, 1883); Farrar, "Early Days of Christianity" 1882; Edersheim, "Life and Times of Jesus," 1883, Introductory; and the Introductions to the Church Histories of Neander, Gieseler, Hase, Schaff, Hurst, Moeller, etc.

I. GREEK CIVILIZATION.

CENTURIES before the beginning of the Christian era (660–324) the Greeks had wrought out a civilization that in literature, philosophy, science, and art, greatly surpassed the achievements of all other nations. Their language had been so developed as to constitute the most perfect instrument for the embodiment and conveyance of thought that had ever been known and is still unsurpassed. Their religion was a polytheistic personification of the powers of nature resting on a semi-pantheistic conception of the world. Their gods and goddesses were the embodiments no less of the baser passions of the human soul than of the nobler qualities, and the moral ideals of the people were low. The idea of sin as an offense against a holy God and as involving guilt was almost wholly absent. Sin was conceived of rather as ignorance, as a failure to understand one's true relations. There is no adequate recognition of the personality of God or the personality and responsibility of man.

II. GREEK PHILOSOPHY.

From 600 B. C. onward philosophy occupied a prominent place in Greek life and in an ever-widening circle of minds tended to undermine faith in the crude polytheism of the time. The possibilities of the uninspired human mind in speculative reasoning were well-nigh exhausted by such thinkers as Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Zeno.

1. *Pythagoras* (582–510) seems to have derived from Egyptian or Oriental sources the doctrine of metempsychosis and that of the harmony of the spheres. Mathematics furnished the basis of his speculative system. The principles of numbers he regarded as the substance of things and as constituting the eternal and self-originated bond of the universe. His doctrine of the harmony of the celestial spheres was based upon the assumption that they are separated from each other by intervals corresponding to the relative length of strings combined to produce musical harmony. ~~The soul~~ he regarded as a harmony, chained to the body as a punishment. Ethical notions were expressed by the Pythagoreans in mathematical form, symbols taking the place of definitions. Pythagoras seems to have taught that the universe is in an eternal flux and that in regular cycles persons and events are repeated. Much stress was laid on a series of contrasts or antitheses, such as Limit—Illimitation, Odd—Even, One—Many, Right—Left, Male—Female, At Rest—In Motion, Straight—Bent, Light—Darkness, Good—Bad, Square—Oblong. These remind us of the æons of the Gnostics, and in other respects

the influence of Pythagoreanism on Gnosticism is manifest.

Pythagoras founded a large number of aristocratic secret societies in the Italian-Greek colonies. These brotherhoods seem to have had a somewhat rigorous ethical code and to have developed a somewhat elaborate ritual. A strict discipline, somewhat like that of monastic bodies, was maintained and the members were forbidden to propagate their views among the people.

A modified Pythagoreanism was much in vogue in Alexandria and elsewhere during the early Christian centuries, and was one of the most influential forms of Greek philosophy in its contact with early Christian thought.

2. *Socrates* (471–399) "called philosophy down from the heavens to earth, and introduced it into the cities and houses of men, compelling men to inquire concerning life and morals and things good and evil."[1] For our knowledge of his ethical and religious teachings we are dependent on his disciples, Plato, Xenophon, and Artistotle. His fundamental conception appears to have been the inseparable union of theoretical insight with practical moral excellence. He believed that virtue was capable of being taught and that all wickedness resulted from ignorance. He fostered the spirit of inquiry by his persistent calling in question of current beliefs, but thereby incurred the hostility of the authorities and forfeited his life. He supposed himself to act and speak under the impulse of a supernatural being (dæmon, *δαιμόνιον*). He defended the existence of the gods and of a divine principle over and above these partial manifestations of deity. He spoke of wisdom as present and regnant in all that exists, and as determining all things according to its good pleasure, being distinguished from the other gods as the ruler and disposer of the universe.[2] Yet he refrained from giving distinct personality to this ruler and disposer, and it is probable that his conception of the universe was monistic or semi-pantheistic. Plato attributes to Socrates an elaborate argument for the immortality of the soul.

---

[1] Cicero.

[2] **Xenophon, "*Memorabilia*," I., 4 : 4 ; IV., 3 : 3, 13.**

13. In *Plato* (427–347) Greek philosophy made its nearest approach to Christianity. He elaborated the thoughts of Socrates and put them into enduring literary form. No Greek writer exerted so much influence on the Jewish thought of the last centuries before Christ or on early and later Christian thought. In order to make himself master of all the wisdom of the past and of his own age he visited Egypt, Cyrene, and probably Asia Minor, and spent some time with the Pythagoreans in Italy. Sicily also was laid under contribution.

> "In Plato's philosophy the expanding roots and branches of earlier philosophy are developed into the full blossom, out of which the subsequent fruit was slowly brought to maturity."[1] "Plato's relation to the world is that of a superior spirit, whose good pleasure it is to dwell in it for a time. . . He penetrates into its depths more that he may replenish them from the fullness of his own nature than that he may fathom their mysteries. He scales its heights as one yearning after renewed participation in the source of his being. All that he utters has reference to something eternally complete, good, true, beautiful, whose furtherance he strives to promote in every bosom."[2]

Plato has well been called "the philosopher of the spirit."[3] His theory of "ideas" may be regarded as the central feature of his philosophy. The "idea" is the archetype (the divine thought or plan) of which material objects are the imperfect reflection. Only the perfect idea is real; what seems to us real is only an illusion. In the archetypal world exists the idea of everything that comes into phenomenal existence. Highest among the ideas is the idea of the Good. Of almost equal rank are the ideas of the Beautiful and the True. He seems sometimes to represent these high ideas as efficient causes and even calls them gods. The world-builder (Demiurge) he seems to identify with the idea of the Good. This idea he regards as the cause of being and cognition and as the sun in the kingdom of ideas.

The prominence given to the Good constitutes his system a highly ethical one. "The highest good is not pleasure, nor knowledge alone, but the greatest possible likeness to God."[1] The motive to virtue should be not fear of punishment nor hope of reward, but the fact that it is itself the beauty and health of the soul. To train its citizens to virtue is the highest mission of the State. Virtue for every individual is perfect adaptation to his calling. He seems to have taught the eternity of matter, which was devoid of quality and of proper reality until transformed and ordered by the good God. While Plato used much language that seems to imply belief in the personality of God, his teaching was fundamentally pantheistic. Some would prefer to designate his system "spiritualistic monism."

---

[1] Boeckh. [2] Goethe. [3] Hurst.

Plato's philosophy, like that of Pythagoras, profoundly affected Jewish thought during the last two centuries before Christ, and its influence on the Christian theology of the second and following centuries was great beyond computation. Says Eusebius: "He alone of all the Greeks reached the vestibule of truth and stood upon its threshold."

Bishop Westcott bears this high testimony to his important place among religious thinkers: "Plato, more than any other ancient philosopher, acknowledged alike the necessary limits of reason and the imperious instincts of faith, and when he could not absolutely reconcile both, at least gave to both a full and free expression. And so Platonism alone, and Platonism in virtue of this character, was able to stand for a time face to face with Christianity."

4. The philosophy of *Aristotle* (384–322), the greatest of Plato's disciples and the tutor of Alexander the Great, exerted far less influence on the religious thought of the pre-Christian time than that of Plato. His intellect was probably the most comprehensive that the ancient world produced. In logic and dialectics he is still supreme. His philosophy is practical and matter-of-fact rather than mystical and speculative. By virtue of his pre-eminence in systematization and formal reasoning he secured recognition among mediæval theologians as the ultimate authority within this sphere. In natural science he surpassed all the other ancients.

---

[1] Ueberweg.

He rejected Plato's doctrine of ideas, maintaining that general ideas are not the only realities or causes of the individuals of a kind, but are mere mental abstractions from the individuals; that the individuals of the human race, *e. g.*, are not unreal reflections of the universal idea man, but that the universal idea man is a mental abstraction from a contemplation of individual men.

Aristotle reached a clear conception of God as an immaterial spirit who is the final cause. He proves that the assumption of such a being or principle is necessary from the evidences of design in nature. This principle or first mover he defined as essentially pure energy. If it were merely potential it could not unceasingly communicate motion to all things. It must be eternal, pure, immaterial form, since otherwise it would be burdened with potentiality. Being free from matter, it is without plurality and without parts. It is absolute spirit, which thinks itself and whose thought is therefore the thought of thought. Itself unmoved, it moves all things. It is the Good in itself and its influence is like the attraction of love. He could not conceive of God as shaping the world at any given time, but looked upon the world-framing process as an eternal one. Thought, which is the mode of God's activity, constitutes the highest, best, and most blessed life. The world has its principle in God. Aristotle approaches the Christian doctrine of a sole personal God, who at the same time is immanent in the universe and transcends it; but it is doubtful whether a recognition of divine personality is involved in his system.[1]

The aim of all moral action, according to Aristotle, is happiness, and happiness consists in living a life of action under the control of reason. This accords closely with Plato's definition of virtue. Morality presupposes freedom of will. His classification of the virtues and his definition of each show deep psychological insight.

5. Less influential than Platonism and more influential than Aristotelianism on the religious life of the pre-Christian and the early Christian time was *Stoicism*, founded by Zeno of Citium (about 308 B. C.). This system was

---

[1] See his "Metaphysics," IX. and XII. *Cf.* Ueberweg, "History of Philosophy," Vol. I., p. 162, *seq.*

closely related to the Socratic, and Socrates "sat for the portrait of the Stoic sage."

The most characteristic feature of Stoicism is its materialistic pantheism. In this respect it is the antithesis of Platonism. Matter and force the Stoics regarded as the two ultimate principles. Only the material is real. Matter as such is motionless and unformed. Force is the active, moving, and molding principle. The working force in the universe is God.[1]

The world as a whole is regarded as conscious and consciousness is identified with Deity. Periodically all things are absorbed into Deity, the evolutionary process beginning afresh after each absorption. This process is regarded as a necessary one.

The human soul, which is the warm breath in us, is a part of Deity and so has capacity for divine influence. It survives the body, but is absorbed into Deity at the end of the cosmic period.

As in Platonism, virtue is considered the chief end of life. Mere pleasure should never be made an end of endeavor. We should do right because it is right and without regard to consequences. Freedom from passion is the mark of the perfect man. Complete self-control and self-sufficiency, with the right and the courage to terminate life when it suits one's purpose, characterizes the Stoic sage. Stoicism produced an elevated but somewhat somber type of character in its votaries. On the ethical side it had much in common with Christianity. Its materialistic pantheism or monism was to exert a marked influence on Christian theology. The moral writings of Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius are so elevated and pure in tone as to suggest dependence on Christian sources.

6. *Epicureanism* (310 B. C. onward), and the various forms of *Skepticism* that arose during the last four centuries before Christ, became the most popular forms of Greek philosophy, and exerted a baleful moral influence on the entire Greek-speaking world and, at about the beginning of the Christian era, on Roman life and thought. Epicureanism was itself essentially skeptical.

---

[1] *Cf.* Ueberweg, Vol. I., p. 194.

Rejecting all mythical forms and conceptions, denying the supernatural and the immortality of the soul, Epicurus taught that pleasure in the present life is the supreme end of man's being. This did not necessarily involve dissolute living, for this does not yield on the whole the greatest amount of pleasure ; but the widespread acceptance of pleasure as the only criterion of conduct could not fail to lead to a debasement of morals. The Skeptics, led by Pyrrho (360–270), asserted that of every two mutually contradictory propositions one is as true as another. The distinctions between the true and the false, between right and wrong, between virtue and vice, were obliterated, and advocates of this doctrine were emancipated from any sort of moral or religious restraint. It was in this form that Greek philosophy promoted so powerfully the worse than Oriental license that sapped the foundations of Greek and Roman society.

III. THE MACEDONIAN CONQUEST.

The conquest and absorption of the Greek States by Philip of Macedon (358–336), and the world conquest of the Macedonian-Greek Empire under Alexander the Great (336–323), diffused the Greek civilization, with its matchless language, literature, art, philosophy, and science, over the then civilized world. Greek became the language of government and culture in Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, and ultimately (after the Roman conquest of the East) in Rome itself. Antioch under the Seleucidæ became a great Greek capital and an important center of culture in which Greek and Oriental elements of life and thought were blended. Alexandria, the capital of the Ptolemies, became the greatest literary, philosophical, and scientific center of ancient times. The Ptolemies lavished their wealth on the gathering of a library and the promotion of learning. It was their ambition to collect in their library the literature of the world, and they expended vast sums in procuring translations into Greek of the chief literary productions of the past. The library is said to have reached the enormous magnitude of four hundred thousand volumes; but if so it must have had many copies of the same works, and individual works must have been numbered by books. The ablest scholars were brought together, and liberal encouragement was given to literary production and to the work of public instruction. The Alexandrian Lyceum was more like a modern university than was any institution of ancient times.

Highly important in the development of religious thought was the formation under the patronage of the Ptolemies of populous Jewish colonies. Under the royal patronage the Hebrew Scriptures were translated into Greek (the Septuagint version), and a large body of religious literature was produced by Greek-speaking Jews who had become imbued with Greek modes of thought (the Old Testament Apocrypha, etc.). In Philo, who lived in the New Testament time, we meet with the ablest and most elaborate effort to blend Hebrew and Greek thought, and by the application of the allegorical method of interpretation to explain away everything in the Old Testament that was out of harmony with the refined spiritualism of the current modified Platonism.

Representatives of Indian theosophy (Brahminism and Buddhism), of Persian dualism (Zoroastrianism), and of the surviving Babylonian sects seem to have availed themselves of the opportunity offered by the desire for universal knowledge that expressed itself so influentially in Alexandria, to expound their systems, and the esoteric philosophy or theosophy of the Egyptian priests emerged from the temples and made its contributions to the stock of current thought.

What is true of Alexandria applies in a measure to the cities of Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece, and by the beginning of the Christian era Hellenistic influence had become almost dominant in Rome, now grown almost as cosmopolitan as Alexandria.

Greek religion, while it furnished a spiritual interpretation of nature, and while it contributed largely toward the development of æsthetic life, failed utterly to produce a pure morality, or to satisfy the religious longings of the more earnest spirits. Long before the beginning of the Christian era its foundations had been undermined by philosophical speculation, and skepticism was almost universal. The blending of Greek thought with the theosophy of the Orient had intensified the religious yearnings of a large class of thinkers without being able to satisfy them, had brought into prominence the great problems of being, such as the origin and destiny of the world and of man, the origin and purpose of evil, the relation of the world-framer to the Supreme Being, the relation of the Supreme Being to man and to the world, the relation of matter to spirit, etc., but had failed to provide any adequate solution of these problems. Many had come to realize the need of a divine revelation, and above all of a Divine Saviour.

IV. THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

The religion of the early Romans was closely related to that of the Greeks. Its differences in development were due chiefly to the idiosyncrasies of Roman character. The Romans as a race were remarkably deficient in poetical and imaginative faculty. They were austere, practical, matter-of-fact, utilitarian. Fundamentally their religion was a pantheistic worship of nature. Everything that exists was regarded as permeated by Deity. The individual deities were partially personified abstractions of the powers of nature. As compared with the Greek religion it produced more of calm piety, was practised with more dignity and order, was more strictly ritualistic, was more carefully upheld and administered by the State, and was more practical in its subservience to the interests of the State. Images and temples were not introduced until a hundred and seventy years after the founding of the city.

Religion with the Romans was never a matter of feeling, always a matter of form. The securing of divine favor was thought to depend upon the exactitude with which all ceremonies were performed and all prayers uttered. The slightest mistake in word or gesture rendered the entire proceedings ineffective. The same rite was sometimes repeated thirty or even fifty times because of slight defects in utterance or manipulation.

Theoretically every householder was the priest of his household as the king was the priest of the State; but the necessity of having the religious rites performed by

[illegible] carried on for sake of Sta

experts gave great power to the priests. They alone had perfect familiarity with the names and functions of the gods and knew precisely what god was to be propitiated in order to secure the needful blessing or to ward off threatening calamity, and also the details of the rites by which favor was to be obtained.

Even before the founding of the republic (B. C. 509) there was a Pontifex Maximus at the head of a college of pontiffs, whose business it was to supervise all the religious affairs of the State and to give judgment in every religious cause. These pontiffs were attorneys and counselors in religious law, and as officials of the State had vast influence.

The College of Augurs were the official soothsayers, whose business it was by observing the flight of birds and other phenomena to determine the attitude of the gods toward contemplated State measures.

The Roman religion in its primitive form seems to have been highly promotive of the sterner virtues. Truthfulness and honesty, almost unknown among the Greeks, were distinguishing traits of the better class of Romans. Family life was comparatively pure, and the virtue of the Roman matron and her dignified position are proverbial. Fidelity to the State at the utmost personal cost was a common virtue and treason was by no means so common as among the Greeks. The Roman Senate at its best was the ablest, most dignified, and most honorable body known to antiquity.

From about 240 B. C. Rome came more and more under the influence of Greek religion and philosophy. The conquest of the East (including Macedonia, Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, and Mesopotamia) was achieved stage by stage (200–63), and Roman law and administrative order were communicated to the Hellenistic provinces; but the conqueror was vanquished by the conquered. During the entire period of contact Rome was gradually appropriating the religion and the culture as well as the luxury and license of the Hellenistic Orient.

It was the policy of Rome to tolerate and utilize for the purposes of the State the religions of conquered peoples. There was no disposition to regard its own gods as exclusively powerful and worthy of worship. Every new god conciliated added so much to the effectiveness of the State.

Most important for our present purpose was the influence of Greek philosophy on Roman thought. It was "the rationalism of Euhemerus, the skepticism of Euripides and the Pyrrhonists, the agnosticism of Protagoras, and the atheism of Diagoras and Theodorus," that found most acceptance among the Romans during the century preceding the birth of Christ. Stoicism, with its materialistic pantheism that often expressed itself in language hardly distinguishable from pure theism, and its stern morality that repudiated pleasure and the hope of reward as motives, was never popular among the Romans; yet it profoundly influenced some of the greatest minds and made an important contribution to the development of Roman law into a system of equity of world-wide applicability.

Disbelief in the current religion had become almost universal among the educated classes before the beginning of our era; but those who were most pronounced in their skepticism insisted on its careful maintenance as a State institution and as useful for the illiterate masses.

When the republic was transformed into the empire (31 B. C.) Augustus strove in vain to check the process of decay and to restore the national religion to its pristine position. He assumed personally the office of Pontifex Maximus, thus combining in his own person the civil and religious supremacy and giving full recognition to the popular religion as an institution of the State.

The practice of apotheosizing and worshiping the emperors, however corrupt and despicable might be their characters, exerted a most degrading influence on the religious life of the empire in the early Christian time; but it introduced a common object of worship throughout its entire extent and had a distinctly universalizing tendency. Provincial assemblies for the exercise of this cult became highly important from a social and political point of view. Bringing the people together, as they did, for festive worship, they promoted political life in many ways.

The religious cravings of the people were catered to but by no means satisfied by Oriental priests, sorcerers, soothsayers, and astrologers, who flocked to Rome and drove a thriving trade. Apollonius of Tyana (3 B. C.–96 A. D.), imbued with the spirit of the Neo-Pythagorean philosophy, practising a rigorous asceticism, and imposing on the credulity of the people by mysteries and pretended miracles, attracted many followers in Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy.

The Roman Empire may be regarded as having prepared the way for the spread of the Christian religion in the following ways:

1. The Roman conquest broke down the barriers between East and West and between province and province, and welded the whole civilized world into an organic whole administered from Rome as its center. Palestine was a Roman province at the beginning of our era and Jewish rulers administered the government under Roman authority. Jews were free as never before to settle in all parts of the Græco-Roman world, and Jewish synagogues, which were in many cases to furnish opportunity for the planting and dissemination of Christian truth, were to be found in every city. A religion originating in Judea had at this time a far better opportunity to make its way throughout the world than it would have had under other circumstances.

2. The extension of Roman citizenship to individuals throughout the provinces was of immense advantage to such preachers of the gospel as possessed it.

3. The construction of excellent roadways throughout the empire for military and commercial purposes was no doubt greatly promotive of the diffusion of Christianity.

4. Apart from the excellence of the roads travel was rendered far safer than it had ever been before. The profound peace that settled over the world, the careful enforcement everywhere of law and order, made the work of the missionary comparatively easy. The Roman Empire was to the early Christian missionary what the British Empire is to the modern, with this important difference, that England favors and protects missionaries as such, while Christianity was to the Roman Empire an unlawful religion and was frequently persecuted.

5. The extension of the use of the Greek language

made it possible for the Greek-speaking promulgators of Christianity to find intelligent hearers everywhere without learning new languages.

A recent German writer says:

> The task of Rome was to unite—to unite, we may say as confidently, for Christ. Born at the same time, the Roman Empire and the Christian Church were also providentially appointed for each other. The kingdom of heaven is like a grain of seed. If the seed is to be sown the field must be prepared. The Roman Empire was the prepared field. The kingdom of heaven is like leaven. If the leaven is to be mixed with the meal, the meal must be shaken together. The Roman Empire was the shaken heap of meal first of all to take up the leaven. All the peoples of the Old World hitherto had lived and labored apart, all their gains and achievements, their riches and treasures, their works of art and scientific results, their ancient traditions and legends, their gods and rites of worship, all existing elements of culture and forces of civilization, were now comprised in one empire. Other empires have exceeded this in territory and in population, but there has never been a second empire in the whole course of history which so united in itself all the cultivated nations of its time.[1]

---

[1] Uhlhorn, "Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism," p. 15.

CHAPTER III

PREPARATION FOR CHRISTIANITY IN JEWISH LIFE AND THOUGHT

LITERATURE: Works of Josephus and Philo (original and English translation); Old Testament Apocrypha (original in Septuagint); Bissell, "The Apocrypha of the Old Testament with Historical Introductions, a Revised Translation, and Notes Critical and Explanatory," 1880; Ball, "The Ecclesiastical or Deutero-canonical Books of the Old Testament, commonly called the Apocrypha," 1892; "The Zend-Avesta," translated and edited by Darmesteter; Reuss, "*La Bible*," Parts VI. and VII.; Wace, "The Apocrypha," 1888; Schürer, "A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ" (English translation), 1885 onward; works on Jewish History, by Ewald (English translation), Jost, Grätz (English translation), and Stanley; Wellhausen, "*Die Pharisäer u. d Sadducäer*," 1874; Geiger, "*Sadducäer u. Pharisäer*," 1863; Cohen, "*Les Pharisiens*," 1877; Derenbourg, "*Histoire de la Palestine*," 1867; Drummond, "The Jewish Messiah," 1877; Drummond, "Philo Judæus," 1888; Dähne, "*Geschichtliche Darstellung d. jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie*," 1834; Gförer, "*Philo u. d. alexandrinische Theosophie*," 1831; Lucius, "*Der Essenismus in seinem Verhältniss zum Judenthum*," 1881; Demmler, "*Christus u. d. Essenismus*," 1880; Articles on Apocrypha (*Apokryphen*), Philo, Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Messiah, Proselytes, Dispersion (*Diaspora*), Pseudepigrapha, etc., in the Encyclopedias of Herzog-Hauck, Schaff-Herzog, McClintock and Strong, Kitto, and Smith ("Dictionary of the Bible"). For fuller bibliography see Schürer, as above, at the head of each section.

THE Old Testament history of the chosen people leaves off with the completion of the fortifications of Jerusalem by Nehemiah, notwithstanding the determined efforts of the Samaritans to prevent it, the introduction of rigorous reforming measures by Nehemiah, and the failure of Sanballat and his associates successfully to resist these measures. The date reached is about 432 B. C. The people had been delivered from their Babylonian captivity by Cyrus, king of Persia (535 B. C. onward), and the temple had been restored by Zerubbabel, under the patronage first of Cyrus and then of Darius Hystaspes (534–515). About 457 B. C. Ezra, a scribe who had remained behind in Babylon, was commissioned by Artaxerxes Longimanus to make inquiries regarding the condition of the Jewish people in Judah and Jerusalem and to convey royal gifts of gold and silver for religious uses. He was also given authority to put in force the moral and ceremonial laws of Jehovah as he understood them, it being part of the policy of the king by thoroughly conciliating the God of the Jews to secure his favor "for the realm of the king and his sons."

I. THE EFFECTS OF THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY.

1. The deportation of the people was by no means complete. Many of the inhabitants of the kingdom of Judah had escaped to Egypt and it is probable that some remained in the land. Of the Northern kingdom a still larger proportion probably remained behind. The breaking up of external religious institutions and the pressing in of heathen peoples had resulted in an almost complete relapse of the remnant of the northern tribes into heathenism.

2. The Jews of the captivity, so far from yielding to the heathen influences by which they were surrounded, were brought by their discipline of suffering to emphasize more than ever the spiritual side of religion and to repudiate with decision everything savoring of idolatry.

3. Monotheism, long inculcated by their inspired leaders, was now thoroughly grasped by the people as such, and the licentious idolatry that had possessed irresistible attractions for the Jewish masses was now looked upon with abhorrence.

4. They were ready to welcome the conquest of Mesopotamia by the Persian kings, who professed a comparatively pure form of dualism and who abhorred the idolatry of the Babylonians, and they no doubt found means of rendering material assistance to the invading hosts. That Cyrus and his followers should show special favor to a people who welcomed their conquest and whose religious and moral ideals had much in common with those of the Persians might have been expected.

II. INFLUENCE OF THE PERSIAN CONTACT.

1. *The Persian Religion.* The religion of Cyrus and his people was a system of dualism whose elaboration is commonly ascribed to Zoroaster (about 660–583), and which is embodied in its most authentic form in the Zend-Avesta. Zoroastrianism supposes the existence from the beginning of two antagonistic principles, good and evil, each having its personal (or personified) head. Ormazd (Ahura Mazda) is the prince of the kingdom of goodness and light, Ahriman of the kingdom of evil and darkness. Ormazd was conceived of as the embodiment and author of wisdom and power, as the promoter of growth and progress, as absolutely holy and beneficent, as unspeakably glorious and fair, as supremely intelligent and watchful. He is the author and upholder of all that is good. His attributes correspond closely with those of Jehovah, the chief difference being the limitation of his power by the antagonistic energy of Ahriman. This difference is strikingly set forth in Isa. 45 : 5–7, where Jehovah says "to his anointed, to Cyrus," "I am the Lord, and there is none else ; beside me there is no God : I will gird thee, though thou hast not known me : that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me : I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness ; I make peace, and create evil ; I am the Lord that doeth all these things." This is a most instructive passage. Jehovah to make good his soleness does not hesitate to claim for himself the functions ascribed by the Persians to Ahriman as well as those ascribed to Ormazd.

Beneath each of these primal principles is a host of subservient principles or angels, each having its particular antagonist in the opposite kingdom. The six good archangels are Vohu Manah (Good Mind), the mediator between Ormazd and man and corresponding to some extent to the Logos (Word) of John's Gospel ; Asha Vahishta (Best Righteousness), the principle of cosmic order ; Khshathra Vairya (the Wished-for Kingdom), representing the aspiration of the people after the universal triumph of righteousness ; Spenta Armaita (Holy

Harmony), embodying the ideal of peace and good will among men; Haurvatat (Wholeness); and Ameretat (Immortality). Closely related to these is Sraosha (Obedience). Standing below these are the Yazatas (Worshipful Ones), of which the chief are Mithra (Angel of Light), Rashnu (Angel of Justice), Arshtat (Truthfulness), Parendi (Riches), Ashi (Rectitude), Verethraghna (Victory), Hvar (Sun), Mah (Moon), Tishtrya (Star), and Atar (Fire). These angelic beings (or abstractions) are almost infinite in number. Each individual human soul is supposed to be accompanied by a Fravashi (Guardian Angel) who contends with the corresponding evil powers and fortifies the soul in its struggle for the right and the good.

Ahriman (Angra Mainyu) stands at the head of the demonic hosts, which are the antitheses of the hierarchy of Ormazd.

Zoroastrian dualism is advantageously differentiated from the pantheistic-polytheistic systems of the East by its doctrine of human freedom and responsibility, which furnished the basis of a relatively pure morality. Persistent choice of the good weakens the power of evil. Purity, physical and moral, is insisted on. Uprightness, charity, and generosity are constantly inculcated. The utmost stress is laid on truthfulness. Asceticism is absent from the system, and the wholesome enjoyment of what nature has provided is encouraged.

The doctrines of the resurrection of the dead and of a future life of blessedness or misery, dependent on the character of the present life and determined by a judgment following immediately the death of the body, are clearly taught. Heaven, hell, and purgatory (the latter for those whose good and evil deeds are found to have been equal), are provided for in the system.

The coming of a saviour and the final triumph of the kingdom of Ormazd, with the banishment "of the wicked, evil-doing Daevas into the depths of the dark, horrid world of hell," are clearly taught in the Avesta and the Pahlavi Texts.

Worship was addressed not only to Ormazd, but just as freely to the lower orders of angelic beings, and some of the litanies remind us of those used in the Catholic churches of the later time.

2. *Persian Influence on Jewish Thought.* This is seen (1) In the excessive scrupulosity with which the later Jews, going far beyond the prescriptions of the Levitical code, discriminated between things clean and unclean; (2) in the relative indifference to temple worship and the stress laid on popular instruction and worship as seen in the formation of village synagogues; (3) in the energy with which the later Jews resisted every effort to induce them to embrace false religions; (4) in the elaborate system of angelology and demonology found in the apocryphal books that were written during the Greek period; (5) in the book of Esther we see Judaism terribly persecuted by the later Persian power and saved by the patriotism of a Jewess, who by her charms had won the heart of King Ahasuerus; (6) the Persian influence is probably traceable as one of the elements in the Essene sect. building

3. *The Synagogue and the Synagogues.* The Jews no doubt became accustomed to congregational worship apart from the temple during the Babylonian captivity. It was not to be expected that with the restoration of the temple they should forego the means of frequent edification and instruction that they had found helpful. Ezra called the people together on the Sabbath days to receive instruction in the divine law, and this practice rapidly spread throughout the land and into the dispersion. The services of the synagogues were intended not to supplant but to supplement the temple worship. The general introduction of synagogue worship marks a distinct advance in the educational status of the people. Henceforth religion was to be more and more a matter of teaching and learning. The "Great Synagogue," in a rudimentary form at least, was organized by Nehemiah, on the occasion of his second sojourn in Jerusalem (436 B. C. onward.) The religious condition of the people he found on his arrival to be deplorable. Alliances had been formed with such enemies of the established order as Sanballat, the Sabbath was desecrated, and the Law was disregarded (Neh. 13 : 6–31). It is by no means certain that the eighty-five priests, who as representatives of the people pledged themselves and their constituents to observe the Law, constituted the Great

Synagogue; but it is probable that out of this united acceptance of Nehemiah's reforms grew a great national organization, composed normally of one hundred and twenty members, whose business it was to promote the due observance of the Law and the results of whose labors are seen in the careful selection and editing of the sacred books and in the formation of the Old Testament canon. To this body was formerly ascribed the introduction of a new Hebrew alphabet, the supplying to the text of certain diacritical signs, the ordering of the synagogue worship, and the beginning of the elaboration of the ceremonial law that was ultimately embodied in the Talmud. During this period, and probably under the direction of the Great Synagogue, schools for instruction in the Scriptures were established, and a class of professional scholars (scribes) arose whose authority was generally recognized.

group of men.

III. THE JEWISH PEOPLE UNDER THE MACEDONIAN RULERS.

Reference has already been made to the importance of the Macedonian conquest as a means of diffusing throughout the civilized world the Greek language and thought, and of promoting the action, reaction, and blending of the religious and philosophical life and thought of Europe, Asia, and Africa. In no way did this great upheaval exert more directly its beneficent influence in the direction of preparing the world for the coming of Christ and for the literary embodiment and diffusion of his teachings than through the Hellenizing of a large part of the Jewish race.

The leaders of the people made prompt, unconditional, and cordial submission to Alexander the Great in 332 B. C. He was so favorably impressed by their attitude and their representations that he treated them with the utmost consideration. The wide dispersion of the Jews, and their ability to be of service to the conqueror as guides to every part of the East and of Egypt no doubt had something to do with the cordiality of his bearing. Considerable numbers accompanied him on his expedition to Egypt. In founding his great Egyptian capital, Alexandria, he offered the most liberal inducements to the Jews to settle there, and large numbers settled in the Fayyum. Ptolemy I. seized and occupied Syria on several occasions (320, 302, etc.), and carried to Egypt thousands of Jews and others, maintaining throughout the good-will of the people, who always resented the authority of the Seleucidæ. The Ptolemies seem to have respected the religious principles of the Jews, while the Seleucidæ attempted to supplant their religion by forcing heathen institutions upon them. A few of the monuments of this important period of Jewish history may be here briefly described.

1. *The Temple near Heliopolis.* Heliopolis was the ancient site of an Egyptian temple, devoted to the worship of the sun. About 164–162 Onias, son of the high-priest Onias III., failing to secure the succession to the Jerusalem high-priesthood, went to Egypt, and with the co-operation of Ptolemy IV., transformed an old heathen temple into a Jewish sanctuary and introduced a regular temple service. This service continued until the temple was closed by the Romans in A. D. 73. While this service was looked upon with disfavor by the leading Jews of Palestine, and while many Egyptian Jews continued to regard visits to the Jerusalem sanctuary as important, its introduction and maintenance mark a distinct stage in the liberalizing of Jewish religious thought.

2. *The Greek Version of the Old Testament* (*Septuagint*). The Jews shared fully in the great literary activity that was fostered in Alexandria by the munificence of the early Ptolemies. Among the most important products of this activity was the Septuagint. No credit is at present given to the Jewish tradition (preserved by Josephus), which represents it as having been produced by seventy scholars appointed by one of the Ptolemies for this purpose, who wrought independently and reached precisely the same result. Considering the vast expenditures of the Ptolemies in the gathering of the Alexandrian Library, it is not improbable that they extended their patronage to this work. It was probably begun during the time of Ptolemy II. (285–247), and completed under Ptolemy VII. (182–146). The Pentateuch was the first to be put into Greek. Palestinian Jews regarded the version as a desecration. Greek-speaking Jews were naturally

delighted to have the sacred oracles in the popular language. The Septuagint is a very free rendering, the desire to bring the Old Testament writings into accord with Greek modes of thought having been largely influential. Extensive additions are made to several of the books, and ultimately the apocryphal books were incorporated. This version is highly significant as showing that a large and influential part of the Jewish people had come to prefer a free Greek translation to the Hebrew original, and that Greek modes of thought had been extensively adopted by the Jews along with the Greek language. It also facilitated aquaintance with the Jewish religion on the part of Greek-speaking Gentiles, and was an important aid to the proselyting efforts of zealous Jews. Before the beginning of the Christian era this version was in common use not only in Egypt, but also in Syria, Asia Minor, and to a considerable extent in Palestine itself. The writers of our New Testament books were for the most part content to quote freely from it.

3. *The Apocrypha.* This term (meaning *concealed* or *obscure*) is applied to the considerable body of Jewish writings that were incorporated in the Septuagint with the Greek translations of the Hebrew canonical books, but which have no place in the Hebrew canon. Several of these (Baruch, in part, the Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach, and 1 Maccabees) were written originally in Hebrew, but are preserved only in Greek. The rest seem to have been composed in Greek. The *Apocryphal Ezra* (1 Esdras) is made up in part of materials from the canonical Ezra, but largely of extra-canonical materials. The aim of the writer seems to have been to present a complete history of the temple from the suspension of the services at the captivity, to the rehabilitation of temple worship after the restoration. The *additions to Esther* consist of a dream of Mordecai regarding the deliverance of his people, the decree of extermination by Artaxerxes, prayers of Mordecai and Esther, a second edict of Artaxerxes, and the explanation of Mordecai's dream. The *additions to Daniel* consist of a prayer of Azarias, the song of the three children in the furnace, and the story of Bel and the Dragon. The *Prayer of Manasses*, in captivity, is usually inserted

among the hymns following the Psalms. *Baruch* purports to have been written by the friend and amanuensis of Jeremiah. It narrates the destruction of Jerusalem, and gives an account of a deputation of Babylonian Jews to Jerusalem on behalf of Nebuchadnezzar and his son, who confessed their sins and sought the intercession of the Jerusalem saints. The *Letter of Jeremiah* is addressed to the Babylonian captives, and is a warning against idolatry. *Tobit* is a charming religious story, which sets forth Jewish life in the Babylonian captivity in its noblest, purest form. It abounds in the miraculous, and Persian angelology figures prominently, but it is highly moral in tone, and exhibits in a striking way the rewards of righteousness and the penalties of wickedness. *Judith* also is an edifying story, whose scene is laid in the time of Nebuchadnezzar. Its aim is to show forth Jewish heroism and virtue; but the heroine acts upon the theory that the end justifies the means, and the morality of the work is from the Christian point of view unsatisfactory. *First Maccabees* is an authentic narrative of the Maccabean struggle against Antiochus Epiphanes. *Second Maccabees* covers substantially the same ground, with some extension of scope, but is legendary and untrustworthy. The other Maccabean books are still less worthy of attention. *Ecclesiasticus*, or *The Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach*, written in Hebrew about 190–170, and translated into Greek by the grandson of the author about fifty years later, is an able, earnest work, in which the influence of Greek philosophy is manifest. It is well worth reading, because of its intrinsic merits and as showing the trend of Jewish thought in the second century before Christ. The *Wisdom of Solomon* is still more decidedly Greek in its tone, and belongs to a later time.

The dates of most of the Apocrypha are uncertain. Tobit may have been written about 200 B. C.; Sirach, about 190, and the rest during and after the Maccabean age. The Wisdom of Solomon and part of Baruch may have been written in the early Christian time.

4. *The Pseudepigrapha.* Closely related to the Apocrypha are the numerous Jewish religious writings of the later ante-Christian and the early Christian time known

as Pseudepigrapha (works falsely ascribed to biblical personages, and so spurious). Many of these are as important as any of the Apocrypha, as showing the types of religious thought current among the Jews at the beginning of the Christian era, and as helping to explain some forms of early Christian heterodoxy. Some of these have been preserved only in Ethiopic versions.

(1) How are we to account for the fact that so large a proportion of the Jewish literature of the age, including several of the Apocryphal writings, were pseudepigraphic? It may be answered: (*a*) That the rights of authorship were from the beginning ignored or disregarded by Jewish writers. Few of the canonical writers took any pains to attach their names to their works. (*b*) The chief concern of writers of this class was to impress certain thoughts as profoundly as possible upon their contemporaries, and as there had been developed an excessive regard for antiquity it was considered legitimate to ascribe their productions to ancient worthies. (*c*) Some of these writings were intended as denunciations of contemporary abuses and of obnoxious persons in authority, and it was deemed safer to embody the uncomplimentary remarks in fictitious works ascribed to the past. (*d*) It may be safely said that in most cases there was no fraudulent intent, but that the end in view was beneficent.[1]

(2) A few of the more important Pseudepigrapha may be mentioned as specimens: (*a*) The *Psalter of Solomon*, probably written in Hebrew, but extant only in Greek, a collection of psalms in imitation of the canonical, attributed to the time immediately following the overthrow of the Asmonean monarchy by the Romans (63 B. C.). The writer regards the Asmoneans as usurpers, and rejoices in their downfall. He represents Pharisaism rather than Sadduceeism. In place of these godless rulers the speedy coming of the Messiah, the Son of David, with the setting up of his kingdom, is earnestly prayed for. Faith in the resurrection and in divine retribution is strongly set forth. (*b*) The *Book of Enoch*, probably composed in Hebrew more than a century before Christ, employed by the New Testament *Jude* (ver. 14, 15),

---

[1] *Cf.* Dillmann, in Herzog and Schaff-Herzog.

much used by early Christian writers, preserved only in an Ethiopic version,[1] consists of a series of revelations supposed to have been made to Enoch. The work is rich in angelology and in astrological lore, attempts to explain everything in heaven and on earth, and contains important expressions of Messianic hopes. The Messiah is called "Son of God," "Son of Woman," "the Elect," "the Word," and "the Lord of Spirits." Its expressions in regard to the Messiah are so clear and definite, and so much in accord with the reality, that some critics have been led to ascribe them to later Christian interpolation. Yet the representation is essentially Jewish, for the Messiah is regarded as "only a kind of deputy for God,"[2] rather than as God incarnate. (*c*) The *Book of Jubilees*, probably written in Hebrew during the first Christian century, and before the destruction of Jerusalem, but extant only in Ethiopic, is a sort of rabbinical commentary on Genesis. It attempts to show how Cain and Abel got their wives, how Noah got the animals into the ark, why Rebekah had a special affection for Jacob, etc. It abounds in angelology and in fanciful stories. (*d*) The *Sibylline Books*, so far as they were a product of Hellenistic Judaism, may properly be classed with the Pseudepigrapha. Not content to claim for their views the authority of the patriarchs and prophets of their own race, some of these enterprising religionists thought it worth their while to ascribe to the Greek Sibyl poetical effusions embodying in ill-disguised form prophecies of the coming Messiah and other Jewish teachings. No doubt it was the hope of the writers to impress Jewish religious thought on pagan minds by this means. Early Jewish Christians carried forward this work of manufacturing Sibylline verses, and many of the early Christian writers quoted from the Sibylline Books as if they fully credited their genuineness. A large body of pseudepigraphical literature grew up in the second and third Christian centuries, especially among the heretical sects.

IV. THE MACCABEAN STRUGGLE.

1. The *Occasion* of the struggle was as follows: Up to

---

[1] German translation by Dillmann, English translation by Schodde.

[2] Bissell.

199 B. C. Palestine, though it had been a bone of contention between the Egyptian and the Syrian rulers and had suffered greatly from invading armies, had been for the most part under the Egyptian rule and with important exceptions had enjoyed a considerable measure of religious liberty. The whole of Syria, apart from Palestine, had become thoroughly Hellenized, and it was natural that with the incoming of Syrian authority pagan influences should be brought powerfully to bear in this stronghold of Judaism. At the time of the Syrian conquest Palestine was in an exceedingly depressed condition and its inhabitants had become weary of Egyptian rule, which of late had been less beneficent than heretofore. Antiochus III. sought to make good his conquest by bestowing favors on the inhabitants. He offered special inducements to Jews scattered abroad to return to Jerusalem, provided a pension for the maintenance of the temple worship, assisted in the repairing and completion of the temple, and expressed his wish that the nation should "live according to the laws of their own country." He exempted priests, scribes, and temple singers from taxation and gave three years' tax exemption to all inhabitants of the city. Those who had been enslaved were liberated. Such is the purport of a letter of Antiochus to his general, Ptolemy, quoted by Josephus.[1] Whether these promises were fully carried out we do not know. Seleucus IV. (187–176) abandoned this policy of conciliation, and his treasurer, Heliodorus, who afterward murdered him, sought to rob the temple of its treasures. But it remained for Antiochus IV., whom his admirers called Epiphanes (*illustrious*), but who was more justly surnamed Epimanes (*madman*), by trampling upon the religious rights of the people, outraging their religious feelings, and inflicting upon them every conceivable indignity and cruelty, to arouse the theocratic patriotism of the nation to the fiercest and most uncompromising resistance. Thwarted in his effort to establish his authority in Egypt he seems to have vented his spleen upon the Jews of Judea, whose brethren in Egypt had no doubt been active opponents of his preten-

---

[1] "Antiq.," XII., 3 : 3.

sions. Much ill feeling had no doubt already arisen between the rigorous Jews and the promoters of Greek customs, now aggressive in Jerusalem itself. The high-priest Onias III. sternly resisted the encroachments of pagan life. His brother Jason led the Hellenizing opposition and was able by the royal favor to supplant Onias in the office of high-priest. Naturally he used his position for the overthrow of strict Judaism. He erected a gymnasium for Greek sports near the temple and sought to occupy the attention of the priests themselves with secular frivolities.

Jason was soon supplanted by Menelaus, who had gained the royal support, and a struggle between these claimants ensued. It was a lamentable time for devout Jews. The attempt of Jason to displace Menelaus by force led to the intervention of the king, who after his failure in Egypt through Roman interference was prepared for any degree of cruelty. The massacre of Jewish spectators at a Sabbath military parade, the plundering of the city, the prohibition on penalty of death of Jewish sacrifices, temple services, and religious rites, the decree for the destruction of the sacred books, the desecration of the temple through the introduction of heathen sacrifices, the forcing of swine's flesh down the throats of priests and devout people, the driving of a herd of swine into the temple precincts, are among the many abominations committed by this ruler, who seems to have been eccentric to the verge of insanity.

2. *Mattathias and his Sons.* The revolt was organized by the priest Mattathias of the Asmonæan family and his five heroic sons. Mattathias soon committed the command of the patriot movement to his son *Judas Maccabæus*, who from 166 till 160, when he was slain in battle, won victory after victory over the demoralized Syrian forces. He was succeeded by his younger brother *Jonathan*, who availed himself of a dispute over the Syrian throne to secure for himself from one of the contestants recognition as high-priest, and from the other civil supremacy, thus becoming the theocratic head of the people. He remained a vassal of the successful contestant and was murdered while seeking to protect him against a later rival (143). His brother *Simon* succeeded to the leader-

ship and declared the nation independent. This was a time of great rejoicing, "for every man sat under his own fig tree and there was none to terrify him, nor were any left in the land to fight against them."[1] Assassinated through the treachery of his son-in-law, he was succeeded by *John Hyrcanus* (135–105), who reigned with brilliant success for thirty years, crushed the Samaritans, and forced the Edomites to become Jews. His age is noted for the full development of the Jewish sects that flourished in the New Testament time and for the rise or better organization of the *council of elders* to be afterward known as the *Sanhedrin*. Internal strife marks the remainder of Jewish history until the Roman conquest in 63 B. C.

V. RISE OF RELIGIOUS PARTIES.

1. *Jewish Sects*. Nothing in the history of Jewish life and thought during the time immediately preceding the beginning of our era is more noteworthy than the sectarian divisions that prevailed. These sects have their germs in the early Persian time, but they reached their full development after the Maccabean wars. Ezra and Nehemiah, with their rigorous separatism and insistence on the exact observance of the Law, were the forerunners of the *Pharisees*. The great synagogue and the rabbinic schools of the Persian and early Greek time were essentially Pharisaic institutions. The Aramaic paraphrases of the books of the Bible (*Targumim*) were Pharisaic products. The elaboration of the Levitical law that reached its final form in the Talmud had a like origin. Determined resistance to the intrusion of Persian, pagan-Aramaic, and Greek customs and modes of thought, resulted in the course of time in producing the narrowness, bigotry, unamiableness, and hypocrisy that our Lord so unsparingly denounced. During the Persian and the early Greek time priests and scribes formed a single class and were essentially Pharisaic. During the later Greek and early Roman time Sadduceeism held the priesthood by virtue of political influence, while the study

---

[1] 1 Macc. 14 : 11, 12.

of the law was almost wholly in the hands of the Pharisees. The great body of the pious Jews of the apostolic age were Pharisees. The worldly aristocracy of the nation was Sadducean. Geiger, a modern rationalistic Jew, compares Phariseeism with Protestantism and Sadduceeism with Catholicism. He regards Jesus as standing primarily on Pharisaic ground and seeking to reform Pharisaism by combating its onesidedness and narrowness.[1] It is no doubt true that Jesus accepted the great body of doctrine for which the Pharisees stood and rejected every doctrine and view of life that characterized the Sadducees.

Judas Maccabæus and the pious hosts (*Chasidim*) whom he led to victory were in principle Pharisees. The name Pharisees (*Perushim*) seems to have originated in the time of John Hyrcanus (135-105), against whose alliances with heathen princes (first Syrian and then Roman) they protested with all earnestness. The term means "Separatists," and emphasized their determination to remain a peculiar people and to resist every effort at amalgamation with the great world-powers. Their numerical and moral superiority led to their complete triumph after the death of Alexander Jannæus, son of John Hyrcanus, who ruled 104–78. His widow Alexandra "put all things into their power" and "made them bear good-will to" her deceased husband.[2] The high-priesthood remained with the Sadducees, but the influence of the Pharisees in all religious matters was thenceforth supreme. separatist

2. *The Characteristic Teachings of the Pharisees.* These were as follows: (1) While laying great emphasis on the study and observance of the Old Testament Law (*Thorah*), they attached almost equal importance to "the tradition of the fathers."[3] To interpret Scripture in opposition to tradition was regarded as highly culpable. (2) They held tenaciously to the immortality of the soul, to the resurrection of the dead, and to the doctrine of future rewards and punishments. Eternal imprisonment and torment are the portion of the wicked. The righteous have "part in the world to come." (3) They had

---

[1] "*Sadducäer und Pharisäer,*" pp. 31, 35, etc.

[2] Josephus, "Antiq.," XIII., 16 : 1.

[3] *Ibid.*, 10 : 6.

a complete system of angelology. (4) They believed strongly in the divine foreknowledge and foreordination, yet insisted upon human freedom and responsibility. According to Josephus: "They assert that everything is accomplished by fate. They do not, however, deprive the human will of spontaneity, it having pleased God that there should be a mixture, and that to the will of fate should be added the human will with its virtue or baseness."[1] They say that "some but not all things are the work of fate; some things depend on the will of man as to whether they are done or not."[2]

3. *The Sadducees.* (1) The Sadducees were in almost every respect the antithesis of the Pharisees. They consisted chiefly of the unprincipled and aspiring few who by ingratiating themselves with the heathen rulers were able to gain offices and emoluments. "They only gain the well-to-do," wrote Josephus; "they do not have as their followers the common people."[3] Again: "This doctrine has reached few men; these however are of the first consideration."[4] The possession of the high-priestly office placed them at the head of the theocracy, and gave them wealth and social rank. Not all priests were aristocrats or opponents of the rabbinic legalism; but many of the most influential in the apostolic age and for a century before were such.

(2) The origin and significance of the name cannot be said to have been fully determined. There is almost a consensus of opinion among modern scholars that it was not derived from the adjective *Zaddiq*, righteous, but from the proper name Zadok. The question at issue is, who of the many persons bearing that name was supposed to be the founder of this type of Jewish life? It is highly probable that Zadok, a noted priest of the time of Solomon, whose posterity had continued to exercise priestly functions during the intervening centuries, was the individual had in mind.

(3) Apart from their aristocracy and their inclination toward pagan customs and modes of thought, the following peculiarities may be noted: (*a*) They accepted the

---

[1] Josephus, "Antiq.," XVIII., 1 : 3.

[2] Josephus, "War," II., 8 : 14.

[3] *Ibid.*, "Antiq.," XIII., 10 : 6.

[4] *Ibid.*, XVIII., 1 : 4.

written Law (*Thorah*) only, rejecting the entire body of traditionary interpretation and elaboration by the rabbinic schools.[1] It was supposed by early Christian writers that they rejected all of the Old Testament save the Pentateuch, but this view is without documentary support, and has been generally abandoned. Adhering strictly to the letter of the Law, they are said to have been more rigorous in the infliction of penalties than the Pharisees, who were able to explain away requirements that conflicted with their moral consciousness.[2] The same principle prevailed in relation to judgments on the clean and the unclean. While following the Levitical prescriptions they mercilessly ridiculed the absurdities of the Pharisaic refinements. (*b*) They denied the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the dead, the existence of angels and spirits, and the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, maintaining that the eschatological system of the Pharisees had no foundation in the Law. (*c*) They were deists, denying the divine activity in human affairs, and holding that man is the cause of his own prosperity and adversity. (*d*) Accordingly they rejected what they considered the fatalistic doctrine of the Pharisees, maintaining that man has perpetually the power to choose between and to do good and evil at his discretion. The similarity of their views to those of the Epicureans was early remarked, and may have been due to the influence of the latter.

4. *The Essenes*. (1) For our knowledge of this sect we are almost wholly dependent on Josephus, Philo, and Pliny. Their accounts are for the most part concordant, but differ in some details. The rise of the party is veiled in obscurity. Josephus implies the existence of the sect about 150 B. C.[3] The descriptions that have come down to us apply to the apostolic age, to which Josephus and Philo belonged. The Essenes were essentially a monastic order. "Their aim of life was to be separate from the world with its evil practices, to live a life of holiness and devotion to God, to benefit mankind, to become the temple of the Holy Spirit, so as to be enabled to prophesy and perform miraculous

---

[1] Josephus, "Antiq.," XIII., 10 : 6.

[2] *Ibid.*, XX., 9 : 1, comp. with XIII., 10 : 6.

[3] *Ibid.*, XIII., 5 : 9.

cures, and to prepare themselves for a future state of bliss and reunion with the Father of Spirits."[1]

(2) About the beginning of our era they are said to have numbered some four thousand, and to have had communities in many of the villages of Palestine. Their most populous community was that in the desert of Engedi, on the Dead Sea. Their numbers, while not large, indicate a considerable influence on Jewish life, for they commonly practised celibacy and depended chiefly on proselytism and the education of children entrusted to them for the maintenance of their numerical strength. It is probable that they enjoyed the confidence and favor of a large number who were not prepared to subject themselves to the rigorous discipline of the sect. It is probable that all the communities were organically united under a single control. Each community had a complete organization. Membership was obtained by initiation into secret rites. After a year's probation and instruction the candidate received ceremonial lustration (resembling Christian baptism). After two years' further testing he was introduced to the common meals and to full communion. A rigorous pledge of secrecy was exacted. Each candidate was required to deliver up his property to the order, and the strictest community of goods was practised. "By putting everything together without distinction, they enjoy the common use of all."[2] Even clothes were common property. The officials for the administration of the communal affairs were appointed by the entire body of the initiated. They engaged in agriculture and in various branches of industry but renounced trade as corrupting in its tendency, and refused to manufacture articles for use in war, or that they judged injurious. In addition to their practice of celibacy they renounced luxury of every kind, forbade swearing, prohibited slavery, eschewed anointing with oil as luxurious, practised frequent bathing in cold water, were exceedingly modest in performing natural functions, and refused to offer animal sacrifices, sending gifts of incense to the temple instead. It does not appear, as has sometimes been maintained, that they renounced the use

---

[1] Ginsburg. [2] Philo.

of flesh and of wine, though they were no doubt abstemious in a high degree.

(3) The doctrinal position of the Essenes may be stated as follows: (*a*) They accepted the Old Testament Scriptures and "are described by the orthodox Jews themselves as the holiest and most consistent followers of the Mosaic law."[1] (*b*) They agreed with the Pharisees, against the Sadducees, in the principal points in which these bodies were at variance. (*c*) They differed from the Pharisees in renouncing marriage and animal sacrifices, and in denying the resurrection of the body. Yet they believed strongly in the immortality of the soul and in future rewards and punishments. (*d*) Essenism has so much in common with the religion of Christ that some writers have been inclined to regard Jesus himself and his forerunner, John the Baptist, as members of this society. There can be no objection to supposing that Jesus, who professedly based his teaching on the Jewish Scriptures, incorporated in his teaching whatever was best and most spiritual in Jewish life and thought. The teaching of the Essenes on seeking the kingdom of God might well be emphasized and spiritualized by the Saviour. Our Lord's requirement, as a condition of discipleship, of a willingness to renounce all earthly ties and possessions reminds us of the Essenic terms of admission to fellowship. The emphasizing of brotherly love is common to the two systems. The Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount strongly resemble the Essenic teaching. The celibacy of John the Baptist and of Jesus, and the preference for celibacy under existing circumstances expressed by the Apostle Paul[2] have been regarded as significant points of contact between Essenism and Christianity. The prominence given by the Essenes to bodily healing has its parallel in the practice of Christ and his disciples, due allowance being made for Christ's exercise of divine power. The renunciation of warfare, oaths, and slavery on the part of the Essenes reminds one strikingly of the attitude of Jesus on these matters. While Jesus did not formally forbid slavery, it is generally admitted that the spirit of his

---

[1] Ginsburg.

[2] 1 Cor. 7 : 25, *seq.*

teaching excludes it. Essenism and Christianity agree in their requirement of absolute truthfulness and purity of heart and life. Both alike lay stress on the practice of prophecy. That Jesus infinitely transcended the narrow limits of Essenism by spiritualizing and universalizing the truths that it contained, and eliminating the formalism and the asceticism that characterized it, does not detract from our interest in comparing the adumbrations of the earlier system with the perfect revelation of the later. (*e*) There are certain non-Jewish or anti-Jewish teachings and practices in Essenism, the origin of which has been a matter of controversy. Many recent scholars, Jewish and Christian (Frankel, Jost, Graetz, Derenbourg, Geiger, Ginsburg, Ewald, Hausrath, Reuss, and Kuenen), have sought to prove that the seemingly anti-Judaistic elements are really derivable from the extreme Pharisaic point of view. Among those who admit the probability of foreign influences opinion is pretty evenly divided between those who ascribe these features to Persian dualism (Lightfoot, Hilgenfeld, etc.) and those who ascribe them to Pythagorean influence (Zeller, Keim, Schürer, etc.). Some (as Lipsius) prefer to derive these features from the influence of Syro-Palestinian heathenism, while others (as Seydel and Lillie) seek to derive Essenism and Christianity itself from Buddhism. The influence of Persian thought on Pharisaic Judaism in general is commonly admitted. There seems little difficulty in supposing that in the case of the Essenes these influences extended somewhat farther than with the Pharisees. That which savors most of Persian influence is the semblance of sun-worship. Josephus speaks of "their piety toward God" as "extraordinary," and grounds this statement on the fact that "they never speak about worldly matters before the sun rises, but offer up with their faces toward it, certain prayers, handed down by their forefathers, as if supplicating it to rise."[1] If Josephus' testimony is accepted, it can hardly be denied that their attitude toward the sun involved a certain amount of superstition, though Josephus seems to commend rather than condemn their practice. Their rejection of animal sacrifices is in accord with Persian dualism, as are also their wearing of white garments, their lustrations, and their angelology. With equal readiness several of the peculiarities of Essenism might be derived from Pythagoreanism, such as "its aspirations for bodily purity and sanctity, its lustrations, its simple habits of life apart from all sensual enjoyments, its high estimation (if not exactly its requirement) of celibacy, its white garments, repudiation of oaths, and especially its rejection of bloody sacrifices, also the invocation of the sun and the scrupulosity with which all that was unclean (such as human excrements) was hidden from it; and lastly, the dualistic view of the relation of soul and body."[1] It is probable that some features of later Pythagoreanism itself are due to Persian influence. It may be said in conclusion that the particulars in which Essenism deviated from Pharisaic Judaism may be best explained by the supposition of a combination of Zoroastrian and Pythagorean influences. The precise methods in which these influences were applied cannot be determined.

---

[1] "War," II., 8 : 5.

5. *The Samaritans.* The territory occupied by the ten tribes before the captivity was overrun by a motley host of heathen peoples, with whom the remnants of Israel became to a great extent amalgamated. The restoration brought back only a small portion of the ten tribes. The refusal of Zerubbabel to allow the people of Israel to participate in the work of rebuilding and to join with them in religious matters led ultimately to the building of a temple on Mount Gerizim and the complete religious estrangement of Jews and Samaritans. The Samaritans have maintained themselves in small numbers until the present time. Their recension of the Pentateuch, while evidently corrupted in the interest of their claim to superiority over the Jews, otherwise represents a very early text. It is not easy to determine the precise religious position of the Samaritans at the beginning of the Christian era. Apart from their contention that Gerizim and not Jerusalem was the true sanctuary, their interpretation of the Pentateuch did not differ, except in

---

[1] **Schürer.**

a few points, from that of the Jews. Their aversion to anthropomorphic and anthropopathic representations of God had probably been developed before the beginning of our era. They no doubt derived from the Persians their elaborate angelology. To a host of good and evil angels they assigned the function of mediating between God and men. The chief cause of variance between Samaritans and Jews after the restoration was the refusal of the former to submit to the rigorous requirement by Ezra and Nehemiah of separation from heathen wives. It would seem that the Samaritans laid far less stress on rigorous separatism and on ceremonial purity than did the Pharisaic Jews. Samaria proved a fruitful soil for Christian heresy in the early centuries of our era.

VI. THE DISPERSION.

1. *The Causes and Extent of the Dispersion.* Enough has already been written to show the extent and importance of the Jewish settlements in Egypt under Alexander and the Ptolemies. What is true of Egypt is true of Syria, where every town had its large Jewish community and its synagogue. A Sibylline writer of about 140 B. C., remarks that every land and every sea is filled with Jews. By this time the Maccabean rulers had entered into a close alliance with Rome. In 139–138 Simon Maccabæus sent an embassy to Rome and secured from the Consul Lucius a letter addressed to all the kings and countries under Roman influence, enjoining upon them to do the Jews "no harm, nor fight against them, nor their cities, nor their country, and that they should not aid their enemies."[1] A list of the princes and countries especially addressed is here given. This list was evidently dictated by the Jewish ambassadors and indicates the extent of the dispersion at this date. It also shows how highly the friendship of this cosmopolitan people was appreciated. As Alexander and his successors had treated them with consideration as an important means of extending and conserving their influence, so now the Romans offer them full protection because they

---

[1] 1 Macc, 15 : 15, 24.

wish to have the support of the Jews in carrying out their stupendous scheme of world-conquest and world-administration. Strabo, Philo, and Josephus, all bear testimony to the influential presence of the Jews in every part of the habitable world. The enumeration of localities from which Jews were present at the great Pentecostal feast in Acts 2 : 9, 11 has the same bearing. They were a great trading people and their commercial importance was generally recognized.

A large proportion of the descendants of those who went into captivity, especially of the ten tribes, made their permanent home in Mesopotamia, Media, and the adjoining regions. Josephus represents the descendants of the ten tribes in these regions as beyond computation.[1] Schürer supposes that "they were numbered, not by thousands but by millions." Nehardea and Nisibis were their chief centers. A large proportion of the inhabitants of Syria, especially in the cities and towns, were Jews. Josephus relates that in Damascus eighteen thousand (elsewhere ten thousand) Jews were massacred on one occasion. This would indicate a vast Jewish population. Philo estimated the Jews of Egypt in the apostolic time at one million. From Egypt they spread westward to Cyrene and southward to Ethiopia and Abyssinia. Asia Minor, Greece, Macedonia, and the isles of the sea, were the abiding-places of multitudes of Jews. Pompey brought many captive Jews to Rome (63 B. C.), but most of these were soon at liberty and prospering in business. The extent of the Roman colony in the New Testament time may be inferred from Josephus' statement that eight thousand Roman Jews joined with a deputation from Palestine about 4 B. C. In 19 A. D. the Roman Jews came into disfavor and were banished. Four thousand men suitable for military service were sent to Sardinia.[2] Sejanus, their accuser, came into disfavor soon afterward and the Emperor Tiberius seems to have allowed them to return (31 A. D.). The Emperor Claudius issued an edict of banishment against the Jews (about 49–52), but it was not carried fully into effect.

---

[1] "Antiq.," XI., 5 : 2.

[2] Tacitus, "Ann.," II., 85; Josephus, "Antiq.," XVIII., 3 : 5.

2. *Proselytes.* It were not to be expected that so vital and aggressive a people as were the Jews of the dispersion should be content to restrict their activity to the maintenance of the faith among themselves. As a matter of fact they gained the reputation of being the most zealous of proselyters. While they were by no means popular in the heathen communities where they resided, and while heathen writers lost no opportunity to hold them up to contempt, earnest spirits were everywhere found who, dissatisfied with the corrupt heathen cults and with the heathen philosophy of the time, longed for a purer, more spiritual, and more authoritative form of religion.

(1) *Methods of Jewish Propagandism.* (*a*) It was probably their doctrine of God as the Almighty Creator and sole and righteous Ruler of the universe, to be worshiped not under material forms but as a spirit, a God who rewards the righteous and punishes the wicked in this life and in the life to come, that was most influential in winning converts. (*b*) Again, Judaism provided, through its sacrifices ~~and purificatory~~ rites, for deliverance from sin and gave the promise of present and future blessedness. (*c*) The morality of Judaism, however far it may have fallen below the Christian ideal, was immeasurably superior to that of the best forms of heathenism. (*d*) The well-being and happiness of the average Jewish family was no doubt, under ordinary circumstances, greatly superior to that of the average heathen family in the same community. These facts would aid zealous Jews in persuading discontented heathen to accept their creed. (*e*) Again, Oriental religions were much in vogue in Western Asia and Europe about the beginning of our era. Egyptian religion, in its various phases, had multitudes of adherents in Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy. The Greek and Roman religions had lost their hold on the popular mind. In searching for something more satisfying and reasonable, heathen were in many cases willing to listen attentively to what skillful Jewish propagandists had to say.

(2) *Numbers of Proselytes.* The numbers won to the Jewish faith must have been very considerable. A careful modern writer states that "at or before the

beginning of the Christian era they might have been reckoned by hundreds of thousands, if not millions."[1] Josephus says: "Many of the Greeks have been converted to the observance of our laws; some have remained true, while others, who were incapable of steadfastness, have fallen away again."[2] "Likewise among the mass of the people there has for a time now been a great amount of zeal for our worship; nor is there a single town among Greeks, or barbarians, or anywhere else, not a single nation to which the observance of the Sabbath as it exists among ourselves has not penetrated, while fasting and the burning of lights, and many of our laws with regard to meats, are also observed."[3] Similar testimony is borne by such pagan writers as Seneca and Dio Cassius. Among the most noted proselytes was King Izates of Adiabene, who sent his five sons to Jerusalem to be educated. His successor, Monobazus, had a palace in Jerusalem. It is probable that a large proportion of the proselytes were very imperfectly instructed in the principles of Judaism and continued to practise much of heathenism; but the multitude of converts in all parts of the civilized world shows that Judaism was at the beginning of the Christian era by no means an obscure religion in which little interest was taken outside of the Jewish nation, but that it was awakening a surprising amount of attention throughout wide circles.

(3) *Classes of Proselytes*. Two classes of converts are distinguishable, "God-fearing Gentiles" or "proselytes of the gate," and "proselytes of righteousness." The former "bound themselves to avoid . . . blasphemy, idolatry, murder, uncleanness, theft, disobedience toward the authorities, and the eating of flesh with its blood."[4] The latter were admitted to all the privileges of the theocracy, after circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice. That proselyte baptism was practised before the beginning of the Christian era has been questioned by some, but without sufficient reason. Some who have rejected the antiquity of proselyte baptism have yet admitted that the proselyte was required to take a purificatory bath after his circumcision and before his admission to

---

[1] Bissell. [2] "Apion," II., 10. [3] "Apion," II., 39. [4] Bissell.

full standing as a Jew; but the distinction between a ceremonial bath and baptism is unwarranted, as the same Hebrew word is used for both. It is probable that the great mass of proselytes belonged to the former class.

VII. THE JEWISH-ALEXANDRIAN PHILOSOPHY—PHILO JUDÆUS.

Reference has already been made to the importance of Alexandria as a focusing point for the world's philosophical and theological thought and to the literary activity of the Greek-speaking Jews in Egypt. Before the beginning of our era there had been developed a remarkable type of philosophical thought known as the Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy. This system reached its highest development and found its ablest exponent in Philo (born 32-20 B. C., died about 53 A. D.).

1. *Sketch of Philo.* Of a wealthy and aristocratic family (his brother held a high ~~office under the Emperor~~ Caius and was the intimate friend of the Jewish King Agrippa), Philo enjoyed all the educational privileges that Alexandria afforded. Thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Greek philosophy and familiar with Greek literature, he was yet a devout Jew. He was of the opinion that the Greeks had derived from the Jewish Scriptures all that was wise, true, and lofty in their thinking. It was his task, as it had been the task of others of his type, to show the complete harmony of the divine revelation of the Old Testament with all that is best in Greek philosophy. It was his conviction that the Scriptures translated into Greek and rightly interpreted might wield a mighty influence for the salvation of mankind. The fact is that his own modes of thought and views of life were fundamentally those of the Greek philosophy (a composite of Pythagoreanism, Platonism, Aristotelianism, and Stoicism), and he undertook to show by applying the allegorical system of interpretation to the Scriptures that these were not as they seemed to be, simple, unsophisticated narratives of the dealings of God with his people, but that underneath the anthropomorphic and anthropopathic representations of God and the uncouth representations of the sins and follies of

the heroes and worthies of Hebrew history, everything that was wise and exalted in Greek philosophy lay concealed.

2. *The Allegorical Method of Interpretation.* This, as applied to ancient documents, was not the invention of Philo or of his Jewish-Alexandrian predecessors. It had been employed for centuries by the Greeks in the interpretation of Homer and was probably in common use among the Egyptian priests. In fact it is an obvious device in connection with any esoteric system of religion. But it is doubtful whether it had ever been employed so systematically and effectively as by this writer. Everything that is opposed to his philosophical conceptions of God and the universe and to his sense of propriety in the recorded deeds of men of God yields readily to this universal solvent. It is almost certain that if Philo and those like-minded had been shut up to a literal treatment of the Scriptures they would have rejected them as falling in their opinion far below the writings of the Greek philosophers in dignity, beauty, and spirituality. Having no true historical perspective, they were unable to appreciate the progressiveness of divine revelation or to understand aright the relation of the human and the divine in Scripture. This corrupting feature of Philo's work was laid hold of by early Christian writers.

3. *Philo's Eclecticism.* His system embraces elements of Pythagoreanism, Platonism, Aristotelianism, and Stoicism, very imperfectly blended or systematized.

(1) His *idea of God*, from which he sought to eliminate everything anthropomorphic and anthropopathic, was exceedingly transcendental. He sought to hold fast to the personality of God and his freedom in willing, and yet denied that he had qualities. God is above all qualities and only negations can be predicated of him. Yet he did not hesitate to affirm that God is eternal, self-existent, omniscient, omnipotent, perfect, efficient, free, and self-determining. In fact he seems to have combined, without reconciling them, the Platonic idea of the divine transcendence and absoluteness with the Stoic doctrine of divine immanence.

(2) Regarding God as *exalted above all possibility of contact with matter*, which he characterizes as "lifeless,

erroneous, divisible, unequal," and hence essentially evil, he felt the need of bridging the gulf between God and the world by the supposition of certain "*creative and regulative Powers*." These Powers seem to combine the features of the current Jewish angelology with those of the Stoic Logoi and the Platonic Ideas. The three sets of expressions he uses almost indifferently. These Powers are represented as the thoughts of God, the heavenly archetypes of earthly things, as that which gives life, reality, and durability to matter, as the breath of God's mouth. It is difficult to determine whether Philo intended to ascribe personality to the Powers or regarded them as mere abstractions. Most of his expressions seem to favor the latter view.

(3) Most important of all for early Christian theology was his doctrine of the *Logos*. Here also he sought to combine Jewish with Platonic and Stoic conceptions. "Philo has gathered together from East and West every thought, every divination that could help to mold his sublime conception of a Vicegerent of God, a Mediator between the Eternal and the ephemeral. His Logos reflects light from countless facets. It is one of those creative phrases, struck out in the crisis of projection, which mark an epoch in the development of thought."[1] The multiplicity of Philo's representations of the Logos make it impossible to define his conception in a single phrase. The Platonic Idea of Good, the Stoic World-Soul, and the Jewish conceptions of the Shechinah, of the Name of God, of the Heavenly Man, of the eternal High Priest, seem to have been combined in his thought and in his expressions. The Targums (Aramaic paraphrases of the Hebrew Scriptures) frequently employ the term Word (*Memra*) to denote God as revealing himself. Such Old Testament representations as "the Angel of the Lord" and "Wisdom" are not lost sight of. In relation to God the Word is "Eternal Wisdom," "the sum of the thoughts of God," "the Idea of Ideas, which imparts reality to all lower ideas," "the whole mind of God, considered as traveling outside of itself and expressing itself in act."[1] He is the "Shadow of God," the

---

[1] Bigg.

"Eldest Son," "the First-born" of God. He is thought of as the "Sum," as the "Creator," as the "Captain," and the "Archangel" of the other Powers. In relation to the universe the Word is represented as the instrumental cause or organ of creation, as the Creator, as the Vicegerent of the Great King. In relation to man the Logos is "the Mediator, the Heavenly Man, who represents in the eyes of God the whole family upon earth."[1] He is the High Priest, the Supplicator, the Paraclete. Philo makes him say: "I stand between the Lord and you, I am neither uncreated like God nor created like you, but a mean between the two extremes, a hostage to either side."

Philo's conception of the Logos falls short of the New Testament doctrine in the following respects: (*a*) There is no sense of the necessity of the incarnation; (*b*) there is no proper feeling of the need of atonement to be wrought out by self-emptying and self-sacrifice on the part of the Son of God; (*c*) there is no place for a divine-human Saviour, for sin is thought of as mere ignorance, as salvation consists in enlightenment; (*d*) it does not appear that Philo conceived of the Logos as a Person in our sense of the term. His personifications are such as he freely applies to any idea whatever.

(4) The relation of the *prologue of John's Gospel* to the Philonic Logos doctrine is still a matter of dispute. While it is not improbable that the writer of this Gospel was familiar either with Philo's writings or with the Jewish-Alexandrian mode of thought from which they proceeded, its simplicity and freedom from heathen speculative elements radically differentiate his representation from the Philonic, and show clearly the divine impress. It was on the theology of the Gnostics and of the Alexandrian school of Christian thought (second and third centuries) that Philo's writings were to exert the most marked influence.

VIII. MESSIANIC EXPECTATIONS.

Nothing was more characteristic of later Judaism than the prominence and definiteness of its Messianic expectations.

---

[1] Bigg.

1. *The Earlier Messianic Hope.* The earlier Messianic hope had been centered in the glorious and blessed future of the nation, and did not go much beyond the range of contemporary circumstances. While the glorious future of the nation was not lost sight of by later Jews, far more stress was laid by them on the relation of the individual and of the non-Jewish world to the Messianic kingdom.

2. *The Doctrines of Immortality and Resurrection.* These having come more clearly into the consciousness of the people, eschatological elements naturally occupy a more prominent place in their Messianic expectations.

3. *God as King of the World.* God is now definitely thought of as the King of the world, and the Messiah as judging and ruling the world on God's behalf. The book of Enoch represents the Messiah as hidden and kept with God before his earthly appearing.[1] His name is said to have been named before the sun, the signs, and the stars were formed.[2] Before the world was created he was chosen and hidden with God.[3] His glory is said to be from eternity to eternity. In him dwells the spirit of wisdom. He will judge the hidden things, and no one will be able to hold vain discourse before him.[4] Very similar is the teaching of the Fourth Book of Ezra. The Messiah was ready to appear as soon as the people should repent and perfectly fulfill the law. A single day of repentance on the part of the nation would usher in Messiah's kingdom.[5]

4. *His Secret Presence.* In some accounts his secret presence is assumed, and his revelation is delayed by the sins of the people. His appearing is conceived of as sudden, and as accompanied by miraculous displays of power. The appearing of Messiah was to be followed by a marshaling of the heathen powers for a final conflict, and the overthrow of these hosts of evil by the power of God. The Messiah then sits in judgment on the throne of his glory. He is called in the book of Enoch "Son of Man," "Son of Woman."[6] He strikes terror to the hearts of the kings of the nations, and destroys

---

[1] 46 : 1, 2; 62 : 7.
[2] 48 : 3.
[3] 48 : 6.
[4] 49 : 2-4.
[5] See Schürer, Vol. II., 2, p. 163, etc.
[6] 62 : 5, *seq.*

them from the face of the earth. "As long as there are sinners in the world, so long does the wrath of God endure, but as they disappear from the world the divine wrath also vanishes."[1]

5. *Renovation and Purification.* The renovation and purification of Jerusalem follows, the new city greatly to surpass in splendor the old at its best. Some representations seem to imply that it existed already in heaven, and was to be suddenly let down at the appointed time.

6. *The Gathering of the Dispersed.* The dispersed are next to be gathered, and are to participate in the glorious and joyful kingdom which, centering in Jerusalem and Palestine, is to extend throughout the world. War and strife shall be at an end, and righteousness, benevolence, and all virtue shall universally prevail. Suffering and disease shall be no more, and men shall live nearly a thousand years, continually renewing their youth. Childbirth shall be painless and physical effort without weariness. Some thought of this earthly kingdom as everlasting, others looked upon it as a prelude to a still more glorious heavenly kingdom.[2] According to some, "the coming age" consists in a renovation of the heavens and the earth. Some supposed that this renovation would occur at the beginning and some at the end of Messiah's reign.

7. *The Universal Resurrection.* The next stage in the panorama is the universal resurrection. This is to be followed by the final judgment. The Jewish eschatology provided for an intermediate state between death and the resurrection in which righteous souls are happy and the wicked suffer.

8. *Non-Suffering Messiah.* From the views of the Messiah already set forth, it is evident that the idea of a suffering and sin-atoning Messiah had little place in the Jewish thought of the age under consideration. If such passages as Isa. 53 were Messianically interpreted at all, little emphasis was placed upon the features of the character and purpose of the Messiah there set forth.

---

[1] Mishna, "Sanhedrin," X., 6. [2] Apocalypse of Baruch and Fourth Ezra.

PERIOD I

FROM THE BIRTH OF CHRIST TO THE END OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE (4 B. C.–100)

CHAPTER I

JESUS THE CHRIST

LITERATURE: The four Gospels constitute the chief sources. See also the Harmonies of Robinson, Clark, Broadus, and Stevens and Burton; the New Testament Introductions of Bleek, Reuss, Weiss, and Zahn; the Lives of Christ by Andrews, Neander, Edersheim, Ewald, Lange, Farrar, Geikie, Pressensé, Weiss, Keim, Stalker, Broadus, and Wallace; works on the Biblical Theology of the New Testament by Weiss, Beyschlag, Van Oosterzee, Stevens, and Adeney; Hausrath, "History of the New Testament Times"; Wendt, "The Teaching of Jesus"; Bruce, "The Kingdom of God; or, Christ's Teaching according to the Synoptical Gospels," and "The Training of the Twelve"; Candlish, "The Kingdom of God"; Fairbairn, "Studies in the Life of Christ"; Schürer, "The Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ"; and "Ecce Homo." The Bible dictionaries and the encyclopedias may also be consulted with profit, as may also the files of German, French, English, and American theological reviews.

I. THE FULLNESS OF THE TIME.

THE last two chapters of the Introduction have set forth the achievements of the ancient world in philosophy and religion, the diffusion and blending of the elements of civilization that had been developed through the Macedonian and Roman conquests, and the failure of ancient civilization to regenerate the world or to satisfy the deeper longings of mankind. Judaism itself, under the influence of the Persian, Greek, and Roman civilizations, had undergone a process of development and had produced a remarkable literature; but the best Jewish life was utterly dissatisfied with actual achievement and looked forward with earnest longing to a Messianic era. In the Roman world faith in the popular mythology had been destroyed by philosophy, and the better forms of philosophy had been supplanted for the most part by Greek skepticism, whose motto was "Enjoy to the full the present," and which was fundamentally anti-social and selfish. Jews and Gentiles alike were in need of a

Saviour, and the better spirits were deeply conscious of that need.

In Jesus of Nazareth was fulfilled all that was noblest and most spiritual in the aspirations of Jews and Gentiles, and in a very direct and accurate way the predictions of the Old Testament prophets. It was only after the world had been made ready for the reception and the propagation of his religion that the Divine-human Redeemer appeared.

For the history of the earthly career of our Lord we are dependent almost wholly on the four Gospels, which from different points of view embody the apostolic remembrances of the acts and words of the Master, and which taken together give us what the Holy Spirit designed we should know about the Word made flesh.

II. THE PRE-INCARNATE WORD.

John alone of all the evangelists lifts the veil of the infinite past, and in the language of the Stoics and of Philo reveals to us the eternal facts and relations of the Godhead: "In the beginning was the Word (Logos), and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that hath been made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. . . There was the true light, which lighteth every man coming into the world. . . And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us." In these simple but profound sentences we have not the gropings after truth of a Philo, but the clear dogmatic statement of the identity of Jesus the Christ, the Word made flesh, with the eternal divine thought and projective activity that conceived and planned and made the universe, and that as the "true light" "lighteth every man coming into the world." The writer is not concerned with the earthly genealogy of the Messiah. He is content to say, "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us."

III. FROM CONCEPTION TO BAPTISM.

1. *The Genealogies.* Matthew and Luke connect the incarnate Saviour with Abraham, the father of the Hebrew people, and with King David. Matthew speaks of

Jesus Christ as "the son of David, the son of Abraham," and indicates the chief persons in the line of succession from Abraham to "Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ." Luke traces the line from Joseph, whose son Jesus was supposed to be, through David, Abraham, and Adam, to God. His list includes far more names than Matthew's, and the two lists, while agreeing in the principal names, differ greatly in detail. But it is remarkable that both trace the succession through Joseph rather than through Mary. These genealogies seem to be wholly independent of each other, but are not contradictory. It would have been easy, with all the facts in hand, to construct scores of different genealogical schemes, in which the lines would cross each other from time to time, all being equally correct and none being complete. It is highly probable that our Saviour did not concern himself at all about his family connections, and that the working out of these schemes occurred after his ascension.

2. *The Annunciation to Mary.* Luke alone records the angelic annunciation to Mary of the conception and birth of Jesus, as well as the circumstances relating to the conception of John the Baptist and the intercourse of Mary and Elisabeth. Matthew records an annunciation by the Lord to Joseph, troubled on account of the premarital pregnancy of his wife, of the conception that had occurred by the Holy Ghost.

3. *The Birth and Childhood.* Luke alone records the occasion of the visit of Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem and the laying of the new-born Jesus in a manger, as well as the angelic annunciation of the birth to the shepherds, the visit of the shepherds, the circumcision, and the presentation in the temple. Matthew alone narrates the visit of the wise men from the East, the alarm and persecuting measures of Herod, the flight into Egypt, and the return. Luke alone tells us that "the child grew and waxed strong, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him," that he visited the temple when twelve years of age, that he was subject to his parents during the succeeding years, and that he advanced "in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men."

4. *The Forerunner.* All four evangelists give accounts

of the ministry of John the Baptist. Matthew and Mark alone refer to his rough attire and his diet of "locusts and wild honey." With the enthusiasm and intensity of a prophet John denounced the sins of the people, warning them that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, urging them to flee from the coming wrath, "preaching the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins," baptizing in the Jordan such as confessed their sins, and proclaiming the approaching advent of one mightier than he who should baptize them "with the Holy Ghost and with fire."

IV. THE BAPTISM, THE TEMPTATION, AND THE TESTIMONY OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

All four evangelists bear witness to the baptism of Jesus by John. Matthew alone refers to the hesitation of John on account of his recognition of superiority in Jesus, and Jesus' answer, that "thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." All four record the descent of the Spirit upon the baptized Jesus, and all but John record the expression of the divine approval.

The temptation, narrated very briefly by Mark and in detail by Matthew and Luke, is one of the most significant events in the early life of Jesus. The materials for this narrative could have come from Jesus alone. The question as to the occasion on which this autobiographical account of a momentous experience was given has been much discussed. The fact that the narrative implies the assertion of Messiahship on the part of Jesus has led some critics to the conclusion that the earliest suitable occasion for the communication of this experience was in the third year of his Galilean ministry, when at Cæsarea-Philippi he took his disciples into his confidence and made known unto them the sufferings that awaited him (Matt. 16 : 21; Mark 8 : 31–9 : 1; Luke 9 : 22–27). But for our purpose the fact of this wonderful experience, and the consciousness of Messiahship that must have resulted, alone need to be insisted upon. The narrative shows that Jesus as a man was subject to temptations, that he was assailed by temptations to satisfy his physical desires by miraculous means, to astonish the multitudes by showing his superiority to natural law, and to make earthly dominion an object of his striving. These temptations must have been real, or they would have no significance. There is no evidence that Satan ever renewed his assault. This consciousness of Messiahship, involving his mission as a suffering Saviour, was henceforth complete.

John alone mentions the testimony of John the Baptist before the priests and Levites, and afterward before the assembled people, to Jesus' Messiahship: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," and his indication of Jesus to two of his own disciples as the "Lamb of God," and so worthy to be followed. One of these was apparently John himself; the other he tells us was Andrew, who having recognized in Jesus the Messiah brought his brother Simon Peter to become the third disciple. He alone records the winning to discipleship of Philip and Nathanael, the transmutation of water into wine at Cana, and Jesus' short sojourn, with his mother, his brethren, and his disciples, in Capernaum.

V. THE PUBLIC MINISTRY OF JESUS.

1. *Duration.* The duration of our Lord's public ministry cannot be accurately determined. The Gospel narratives are apparently constructed on no chronological plan, and the data for accurate chronology are wanting. The recurrence of Passovers during the ministry has been supposed to form a basis for determining the number of years covered; but much uncertainty exists as to the number of Passovers. Supposing his public ministry to have begun after the fifteenth year of Tiberius, the date given by Luke (3 : 1, *seq.*) for John's ministry, it could not have been much earlier than the beginning of A. D. 29. On the basis of John 2 : 13; 5 : 1; 6 : 4; and 13 : 1, rests the supposition that Jesus' ministry lasted for three years. But the "feast of the Jews" (ver. 1) was probably not a Passover. The first three Gospels make distinct mention of only one Passover, that at the close of Jesus' ministry. It must be left an open question whether the crucifixion occurred in the spring of 30, or in that of 31. In the former case we should have a ministry of one year and a part of another, in the latter of more than two full years.

2. *Divisions.* The public career of Jesus may be divided as follows: (1) The Early Judean Ministry, of which John alone gives an account (2 : 13–4 : 42), and which includes some of his most important teachings and acts: The first cleansing of the temple, the conversation with Nicodemus, the preaching and baptizing in Judea, John's testimony at Ænon, and the visit to Samaria, with the conversation with the woman at Jacob's well; (2) The Galilean Ministry to the Choosing of the Twelve, recorded chiefly in the Synoptic Gospels, with a few parallels in John; (3) the Galilean Ministry from the Choosing of the Twelve to the Withdrawal to Northern Galilee; (4) the Galilean Ministry till the Departure for Jerusalem; (5) the Perean Ministry on the way to Jerusalem; (6) the Passion Week; (7) the Forty Days from the Resurrection to the Ascension.[1]

3. *Jesus' Conception of his Life-Work.* As already suggested, consciousness of Messiahship was present at the baptism and became clear and definite in connection with the temptation. The task he assumed was the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth, a kingdom "not of this world," that "cometh not with observation," that is "within" believers, that is likened to "a grain of mustard seed," which, though exceeding small, becomes a tree, to a bit of leaven that leavens the mass of meal, to treasure hidden in the field which should be purchased at whatever cost, and to a "pearl of great price" for which all of one's possessions are no more than a fair equivalent. He made it clear from the beginning that he could not carry out the Messianic programme of current Jewish thought. His kingdom was "to have no officers, no headquarters, no political features, no worldly associations."[2] It was to be a spiritual kingdom, whose membership was to consist of individuals won to belief in his divine personality and mission, brought into loving obedience to his will, united with him spiritually in his plans and purposes, ready to take up their crosses and follow him, ready to suffer obloquy, the breaking up of all social and family ties, and death itself for his sake, whose relationship to him he declared to be that of the

---

[1] "Harmony," of Stevens and Burton.

[2] Votaw.

branches to the vine, and who should abide in him as he in them. His disciples were to be "born anew" (or "from above"). A complete transformation of the individual character and life was to be a condition of entrance into his kingdom. He chose to deny himself all earthly possessions and comforts in order that he might devote himself unreservedly to the well-being of his fellow-men. He required renunciation of all earthly things as a condition of discipleship. Some who, imbued with Jewish Messianic ideas, had arrayed themselves among his disciples under the impression that an earthly kingdom was to be established by the Master, forsook him when he made known to them clearly that his religion was one of absolute self-denial, and that it involved on his part and on theirs boundless sufferings.

The Beatitudes set forth his ideal of life. Poverty of spirit and material poverty even to the extent of hunger and thirst, mourning and weeping, subjection to the hatred and abuse of men, are to be regarded as blessings; meekness, purity in heart, peace-making, are commended; while woe is pronounced upon the rich, the full, the laughing, and the popular. Self-humiliation is a condition of true exaltation, self-exaltation leads to real abasement. He came not to destroy the law but to fulfill it. Love to God, involving a spirit of absolute obedience to his will and joyful participation in his plans and purposes, and involving specifically love to man equal to love of self, he represents as the sum and substance of the law. Enemies are to be loved, not hated. Retaliation and revenge are absolutely prohibited. To make sure of sufficiently emphasizing his disapproval of revenge he commands that evil be repaid with good.

Jesus represented himself as a revealer of the Father from whom he came forth and to whom he was to return, as "the way, the truth, and the life," *i. e.*, as the way by which sinful men may return to the Father, as the embodiment of all truth that sinful men need to know in order to their eternal well-being, as the life by participation in which through faith men may become sons of God.

His life of self-denial and well-doing was to culminate in a sacrificial death. He represents himself as a shepherd voluntarily laying down his life for the sheep (John 10 : 17, 18), as giving "his life a ransom for many" (Mark 10 : 45). He regarded his violent death as a fulfillment of Scripture and the time of it as fixed in the divine purpose. On his part the sacrifice was to be a voluntary one. He had power to lay down his life and power to take it again. His going away, according to the Johannean representation, was a condition of the coming of the Paraclete, who should lead his disciples into all truth, and it would entitle them to claim in his name the exercise of unlimited divine power on their behalf.

5. *His Methods of Teaching*. On a few occasions Jesus addressed great multitudes. The Sermon on the Mount is the most noteworthy specimen of a prolonged address of this sort. In this remarkable discourse the ethical element prevails. Jesus sets forth in brief, pointed, emphatic sayings the contrast between the type of life that belongs to his kingdom and that which prevailed in current Judaism. It is a gospel not of outward observances or of doctrinal definitions, but of the inner life. Nothing is said about faith, repentance, atonement, or baptism, but much about inward conformity to the law of God, which is essentially the law of love. His shorter discourses frequently assumed the form of parables, as was very common among Oriental teachers. Private conversations, as in the cases of Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman, gave occasion for many of his most precious utterances. To the inner circle of his disciples he was wont to give explanations of his parabolic discourses and to communicate his plans and purposes more clearly than to the unreceptive multitude. Yet he had frequently to complain bitterly of lack of understanding on the part of those who had been so long time with him, though, "Never man spake like this man."

6. *His Works of Power*. Nothing is more striking in the career of Jesus than his reserve in the exercise of divine power in the physical realm. Miracles were expected by the Jews as "signs" of Messiahship, but when asked for from motives of curiosity or demanded in a spirit of unbelief they were uniformly refused. Most of his mighty works were the proper expression of his benevolence, as in the restoration of their dead to bereaved

relatives, the feeding of the famishing multitudes, the casting out of demons, the healing of the sick and the blind. They were also "symbols of his spiritual and saving work. . . When he healed bodily blindness it was a type of the healing of the inner eye; when he raised the dead, he meant to suggest that he was the Resurrection and the Life in the spiritual world as well; when he cleansed the leper, his triumph spoke of another over the leprosy of sin."[1]

7. *His Rejection by his People.* "He came unto his own (possessions), and his own (people) received him not." His explanation of this rejection was that light had come into the world and that men loved darkness rather than light because of their evil deeds. To their unwillingness to do God's will he attributed their unbelief in himself. Their rejection and malicious plottings he ascribed to the influence of the devil, whose children he declared the unbelieving Jews to be. Like him they were liars and enemies of the truth. They were the bond-servants of sin, when by accepting the truth they might become free. Though he accepted to a great extent the doctrinal teaching of the Pharisees, as against those of the Sadducees, his antagonism to a religion of outward observances, his denunciation of current Pharisaism as hypocrisy, and his proclamation of the doctrine that love to God and love to man rather than ceremonial sacrifices, avoidance of things unclean, and physical purgations, constitute true religion; and his disregard of the rules of Sabbath observance and insistence that the Sabbath was made for man not man for the Sabbath, aroused the bitterest antagonism of the Pharisaic guardians of the Law and led them to resolve on his death. The aristocratic Sadducees, including the high priests and the political party in sympathy with Roman life and rule, no doubt regarded Jesus as a fanatic, the prevalence of whose teachings would imperil the hierarchical system in which they were deeply interested, and they were willing to co-operate with the Pharisees in measures for his destruction. The Roman officials, feeling little personal interest in Jewish religious questions, thought it a matter of policy to gratify the in-

---

[1] Stalker.

fluential parties at the expense of an obscure enthusiast, who moreover was represented as calling himself a king and as hostile to Cæsar.

A few hundred more or less closely attached followers and a small band of devoted disciples constituted the apparent result of Jesus' ministry. Few even of these had entered fully into an understanding of his teaching or into sympathy with his purposes. In Galilee, where Pharisaism was comparatively uninfluential, he gained considerable recognition ; in Judea, where Pharisaism was strong, he made little impression. At the critical moment, when confession of Jesus might mean death, all forsook him and fled, Peter, who had been foremost to confess his divine character and Messiahship, denying him with cursing and swearing.

8. *The Trial and Crucifixion.* Of those who had attached themselves to Jesus a large proportion were grievously disappointed because of his failure to fulfill the Jewish Messianic hopes. On one occasion (John 6 : 15) an effort was made to force him to become king. Disappointed in their expectations and repelled by his mysterious statement about the necessity of eating his flesh and drinking his blood (John 6 : 53–58), "many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him" (ver. 66). On this occasion he foretold the treachery of one of his disciples (ver. 70). At last he determined on going to Jerusalem for the Passover, arousing the popular enthusiasm by a public proclamation of his Messiahship, making a triumphal entry into the city, and suffering the death that he foresaw awaited him.

The popular enthusiasm alarmed Sadducees and Pharisees alike, and the two parties united in compassing his death. An insurrection would bring upon Jewish officials the condemnation of the Roman government. It must be prevented by the destruction of the popular leader. His prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, for whose salvation he yearned, the conspiracy between the chief priests and Judas for his quiet arrest, the last Supper and the designation of the traitor, the farewell discourses, the intercessory prayer, the watching and agonizing in Gethsemane, the betrayal and arrest in the garden, his arraignment before Caiaphas, the high priest, his condemnation on the ground of blasphemy because of his confession of Messiahship, the mockings, scourgings, and contemptuous treatment following the condemnation, the shameful denial of Peter, the trial before Pilate, the attempt of Pilate to release him, the cry of the multitude, " Crucify him, crucify him," Pilate's weak yielding against his own judgment to the demands of the Jews, the crucifixion—these events followed each other with startling rapidity, and to the terrified disciples the cause of Jesus no doubt seemed to suffer an ignominious collapse.

9. *The Resurrection and Ascension.* Notwithstanding the plainness of his predictions, the disciples seem to have had little expectation of the resurrection of their Master. His repeated manifestation after the resurrection, his words of counsel now wonderfully impressive, above all the Great Commission : " All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost : teaching them to observe whatsoever I commanded you : and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world " (Matt. 28 : 16–20 ; cf. Mark 16 : 15–18), his final words showing that his death and resurrection had been in fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy, commanding that " repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning at Jerusalem " (Luke 24 : 47), his reminder to his disciples that they were witnesses of these things, his bidding them tarry in the city until they should be clothed with power from on high, his ascension into heaven—these words and manifestations made heroes of the timid, discouraged disciples. They were now convinced, as they could never have been convinced before his death and resurrection, of the spirituality of his kingdom and the certainty of its triumph. " They worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy : and were continually in the temple, blessing God " (Luke 24 : 52, 53). The teachings of the Master, treasured in their memory but imperfectly understood, now became luminous and glorious. They were able now to enter with consuming zeal upon the great task

of evangelizing the world that he had marked out for them with full assurance of ultimate triumph.

VI. SOME ESTIMATES OF THE CHARACTER AND INFLUENCE OF JESUS.

The most important testimonies are contained in the apostolic writings, but as these are familiar and will be utilized to some extent in the next chapter, more recent estimates will be here given:

> It is generally allowed that Jesus appeared as a public man with a mind whose ideas were completely developed and arranged, with a character sharpened over its whole surface into perfect definiteness, and with designs that marched forward to their ends without hesitation. . . The reason of this must have been that during the thirty years before his public ministry began his ideas, his character, and designs went through all the stages of a thorough development. . . For one with his powers at command, thirty years of complete reticence and reserve were a long time. Nothing was greater in him afterward than the majestic reserve in both speech and action that characterized him.[1]

Referring to the Messianic prophecy in Isa. 42 : 1–4 represented as fulfilled in Jesus (Matt. 12 : 18–21) Bruce remarks:

> No other type of Messiah could have any attractions for him; not the political Messiah of the Zealots, whose one desire was national independence; not the Messiah of common expectation, who should flatter popular prejudices and make himself an idol by becoming a slave; not the Messiah of the Pharisees, himself a Pharisee, regarding it as his vocation to deliver Israel from pagan impurity; not even the austere Messiah of the Baptist, who was to separate the good from the evil by a process of judicial severity, and so usher in a kingdom of righteousness. The Messiah devoutly to be longed for, and cordially to be welcomed when he came, in his view was one who should conquer by the might of love and truth; who should meet the deepest wants of man, not merely gratify the wishes of the Jews, and prove a Saviour to the whole world; who should be conspicuous by patience and hopefulness, rather than by inexorable sternness,—a humane, universal, spiritual Messiah, answering to a divine kingdom of kindred character,—the desire of all nations, the fulfillment of humanity's deepest longings, therefore not destined to be superseded, but to remain an Eternal Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.
>
> The teacher made the truth he taught. His teaching was his articulated person, his person his incorporated teaching. The divin-

---

[1] Stalker

ity the one expressed, the other embodied. He came to found a kingdom by manifesting his kinghood, by declaring himself a king. The King was the center round which the kingdom crystallized. His first words announced its advent; his last affirmed its reality, though a reality too sublimely ideal to be intelligible to the man of the world.[1]

His teaching . . . from the very first has for its background a unique self-consciousness, the incomparable significance of his person, and from the beginning was directed toward something that must be more than teaching, that must be work and deed, viz., the founding of God's kingdom. And this founding was finally accomplished, not by his teaching as such, but by his personal devotion to and completion of his life-work, by his death and resurrection. Does his teaching thereby lose its original fundamental significance, and sink down to a mere introduction to New Testament revelation? It must be said that little as the teaching of Jesus in itself, apart from the conclusion of his life, could have called into existence the kingdom of God, as little could that ending of his life have called it into being without the foregoing doctrinal revelation.[2]

The glad tidings which Jesus proclaimed were tidings of the kingdom of God. In delivering this message he, on the one hand, proclaimed the fact that the kingdom was beginning to be set up; and on the other hand he announced the requirements to be fulfilled in view of that fact. The whole contents of the teaching of Jesus can be classed under this general theme, and the two points of view from which he expounded it. His preaching in regard to the kingdom of God contained partly instruction as to the existence of the kingdom, its nature, its realization, and development; and partly exhortations to the fulfillment of the conditions of membership. . . His object was to establish that kingdom practically among his hearers; and therefore he continually aimed at inciting them to become members of it.[3]

No life ends even for this world when the body by which it has for a little been made visible disappears from the face of the earth. It enters the stream of the ever-swelling life of mankind, and continues to act there with its whole force for evermore. Indeed, the true magnitude of a human being can often only be measured by what this after life shows him to have been. So it was with Christ. The modest narrative of the Gospels scarcely prepares us for the outburst of creative force which issued from his life when it appeared to have ended. His influence on the modern world is the evidence of how great he was; for there must have been in the cause as much as there is in the effect. It has overspread the life of man and caused it to blossom with the vigor of a spiritual spring. It has absorbed into itself all other influences, as a mighty river, pouring along the center of a continent, receives tributaries from a hundred hills. And its quality has been even more exceptional than its quantity. The life of Christ in history cannot cease. His influence waxes more and more; the dead nations are waiting till it reaches them, and it is the hope of the earnest spirits that are bringing in the new earth. All discoveries of the modern world, every development of juster ideas, of higher powers, of more exquisite feelings in mankind, are only new helps to interpret him; and the lifting up of life to the level of his ideas and character is the programme of the human race.[1]

---

[1] Fairbairn. [2] Beyschlag. [3] Wendt.

---

[1] Stalker.

CHAPTER II

THE APOSTLES

LITERATURE: The Acts of the Apostles, the apostolic Epistles, and the Apocalypse contain nearly all the authentic materials. See also Josephus, "Jewish War," "Against Apion," and "Autobiography"; Neander, "Planting and Training of the Christian Church"; Döllinger, "First Age of Christianity and the Church"; Schürer, "History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ"; Hausrath, "History of New Testament Times"; Baur, "Church History of the First Three Centuries"; Keim, "*Rom u. d. Christenthum*"; Ewald, "History of Israel," Vol. VII; Weizsäcker, "The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church"; McGiffert, "The Apostolic Age"; Ramsay, "The Church in the Roman Empire before A. D. 170," and "St. Paul, the Traveler and Roman Citizen"; Harnack, "*Gesch. d. Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*," esp. part II., "*Die Chronologie*"; works on New Testament Introduction and the Biblical Theology of the New Testament, as in Chap. I.; works on the Life of Paul, by Conybeare and Howson, Farrar, Geikie, Sabatier, Stalker, and Baur; Vedder, "The Dawn of Christianity"; Wallace, "Labors and Letters of the Apostles"; Pfleiderer, "Paulinism"; Bruce, "St. Paul's Conception of Christianity"; Stevens, "The Pauline Theology," and "The Johannine Theology"; Schiller, "*Gesch. d. röm. Kaiserzeit unter d. Regierung d. Nero*"; Addis, "Christianity and the Roman Empire"; Uhlhorn, "Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism," and "Christian Charity in the Ancient Church"; Lightfoot, "Dissertations on the Apostolic Age"; Farrar, "The Early Days of Christianity"; and Arnold, "*Die neronische Christenverfolgung*."

I. THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH TO THE CONVERSION OF SAUL.

1. *The Pentecostal Baptism.* The risen Lord had charged his disciples "not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which, said he, ye heard from me: for John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence" (Acts 1 : 4, 5). They seem not yet to have given up their Jewish Messianic hopes. Before the Lord's ascension they had asked him whether he was about to "restore the kingdom to Israel" (Acts 1 : 6). He replied that it was not for them "to know times or seasons, which the Father hath set within his own authority."

F

But he assured them that they should receive power when the Holy Ghost should come upon them, and that they should be his "witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." After the ascension, as they were standing in a dazed condition "looking stedfastly into heaven, two men stood by them in white apparel," and assured them that this Jesus, which was received up from them into heaven, should so come in like manner as they beheld him going into heaven. Returning to their lodgings in Jerusalem, profoundly impressed by what they had seen and heard, the eleven "with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren, with one accord continued stedfastly in prayer." During these days of prayerful waiting, Peter called attention to the breach in the ranks of the Twelve caused by the treachery of Judas, and Matthias was appointed by lot to fill it.

On the day of Pentecost (fifty days after the Passover), when Jews and proselytes "from every nation under heaven" had gathered in Jerusalem, the disciples "were all together in one place. And suddenly there came from heaven a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder, like as of fire; and it sat upon each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." The gathered multitude of Jews and proselytes were drawn together by the noise and "were confounded because that every one heard them speaking in his own language." Some were amazed, thinking a great miracle was being wrought, while others attributed the phenomena to drunkenness on the part of the disciples. Peter repudiated the charge of drunkenness and showed that the marvelous phenomena were the fulfillment of a prophecy of Joel. He took occasion to make an impassioned address on "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God . . . by mighty works and wonders and signs," as his hearers themselves knew. He dwelt upon the fact that he had been crucified and slain "by the hand of lawless men," having been "delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," and upon the fact that "God raised him up, having loosed the pangs of death." Of the resurrection he said, "we all are witnesses." He attributed the wonderful phenomena that had brought the people together to the agency of Christ in his exaltation at the right hand of God. He declared to the house of Israel: "God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified." The awakened multitude asked what they should do. Peter exhorted them to "repent" and "be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of" their "sins." About three thousand heeded the exhortation and were baptized that day. "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers" (Acts 2).

2. *The Jerusalem Church.* The original disciples, with their multitude of enthusiastic converts baptized upon a profession of their faith, may be said to have constituted the first Christian church. Our Lord himself seems to have organized no local communities of believers. He preached in the synagogues and in the temple and had his inner and outer circles of baptized disciples, and these as a whole may, without impropriety, be designated as the pre-pentecostal church. But the churches, as organized bodies, are an apostolic institution. Even after Pentecost the great body of believers in Jerusalem had for some time very little organization.

It is related that "fear came upon every soul and many wonders and signs were done by the apostles." This would indicate the prevalence of intense religious excitement and expectancy. These believers had not yet adjusted themselves to their new relations and were doubtless uncertain whether it was the will of the Lord that they should continue to live in the world and to occupy themselves with secular concerns. "And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, according as any man had need. And day by day, continuing stedfastly with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people. And the Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved." This disregard of secular interests beautiful in itself and highly appropriate at the time could only be temporary in that or any other community. The common supply of the necessaries of life would soon be exhausted and the entire body would be reduced to dependence on miracles or on charity.

The healing of a lame man by Peter and John at the door of the temple brought together a crowd of people to whom Peter preached Jesus as the crucified, risen, and glorified Servant, as the Prince of life, as the Holy and Righteous One, whose sufferings had been foretold by the prophets and "whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things." The concourse of the people and Peter's enthusiastic preaching alarmed the "priests and the captain of the temple and the Sadducees," who arrested Peter and John. Their boldness and the certainty that a miracle had been performed so impressed the authorities that the apostles were released. The number of believers had by this time increased to five thousand (Acts 4 : 4).

It is remarkable that in the preaching of this time great stress is laid on the fulfillment of prophecy in the death and resurrection of Jesus; and yet the Jews are made to feel the guilt of his crucifixion.

The liberation of the apostles was an occasion of thanksgiving and praise on the part of the brethren. It is reported (Acts 4 : 31) that "the place was shaken wherein they were gathered together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with boldness. And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and soul: and not one of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common . . . for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto each, according as any one had need."

The deception of Ananias and Sapphira and their sudden death under Peter's censure, and many other "signs and wonders wrought among the people" (Acts 5 : 12), caused "multitudes both of men and women" to be added to the Christians. Peter's credit increased to such an extent that the people brought their sick into the streets that his shadow might fall on them, and multitudes of sick were brought from the cities round about to be healed by him. Again the Sadducaic authorities threw the apostles into prison, but an angel of the Lord opened the prison door and bade them preach in the temple to the people. Arraigned again and bidden to desist from preaching, they declared that they must obey God rather than men. Warned by Gamaliel as to the futility of violent interference with enthusiasts, the authorities beat them and let them go, charging them "not to speak in the name of Jesus."

The presence in the city of more than five thousand believers, many of whom were dependent on the charities daily distributed, rendered the problem of equitable distribution a very serious one. The apostles, occupied much in the ministry of the word, in response to complaints of neglect on the part of the Hellenistic Jews, asked the brethren to select from their number "seven men of good report, full of the Spirit and of wisdom," whom they might "appoint over this business." The choosing of Stephen and six others by the brethren and their appointment by the apostles with prayer and the laying-on of hands constituted these the first officials, apart from the apostles, in the infant church. It is interesting to note that these servers of tables were introduced in response to a deeply felt practical need and not as part of a deliberately planned system of church order.

Following the introduction of this division of labor in the Jerusalem church we are informed that "the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem exceedingly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." This continued multiplication must have brought the numbers far above five thousand, the last numerical estimate given. Nothing is known of the subsequent career of the "great company" of converted priests.

Stephen proved to be not only a server of tables but a minister of the word as well. "Full of grace and power," he "wrought great wonders and signs among the people." The discomfiture of certain Hellenistic

Jews who tried to argue with Stephen led them to accuse him of blasphemy against Moses and against God. Arraigned before the Jewish authorities on this charge, he gave utterance to the inspired discourse recorded in Acts 7, in which he showed that Jesus is the proper complement of Hebrew history and the true fulfillment of Hebrew prophecy, and ended with a stern denunciation of the Jews before him as "stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears" and as "betrayers and murderers" of "the Righteous One" foretold by the prophets whom their fathers had persecuted. Enraged by his denunciations, they refused to hear more, but "rushed upon him with one accord; and they cast him out of the city, and stoned him, who, having had a vision of the opened heavens," with "the glory of God and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God," committing his spirit to the Lord Jesus, prayed that the sin of his murder might not be laid to the charge of his murderers, and "fell asleep."

It is related that "the witnesses" against Stephen "laid down their garments at the feet of a young man named Saul," and that "Saul was consenting unto his death."

The martyrdom of Stephen is significant for the following reasons: First, because it was the first Christian martyrdom; secondly, because it introduced a general persecution of the Christians in Jerusalem and led to their dispersion and to the wide dissemination of Christian truth; and thirdly, because it launched upon his persecuting career Saul of Tarsus, there having already been planted in his mind and heart seeds of truth that would afterward spring up and bear fruit.

The solemn burial of Stephen by his devout brethren is followed immediately in the narrative by a record of Saul's persecuting work: "But Saul laid waste the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women committed them to prison."

"They that were scattered abroad," we are informed, "went about preaching the word." Philip, another of the seven servers of tables, was among the first to enter upon evangelistic labor outside the city. Shortly after the outbreak of persecution he "went down to the city of Samaria and proclaimed unto them the Christ." His preaching and his healing of the sick aroused profound interest, and the consideration thus gained by the evangelist caused a certain magician named Simon to covet the power of the Spirit and to submit to baptism in order that he might gain it. When the news of the reception of the gospel by the Samaritans reached the apostles in Jerusalem they sent Peter and John to look after the new believers. Philip had baptized them "into the name of the Lord Jesus." The apostles prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost, and as "they laid their hands upon them" they received this special enduement. Simon Magus sought to purchase the power of communicating the Holy Spirit, and received the scathing rebuke of Peter. The name of Simon figures prominently in the pseudonymous works of the second and third centuries as one of the most corrupt of the Gnostic leaders and as a malignant opponent of Peter and of orthodox Christianity. The villages of Samaria were also evangelized at this time.

Under divine impulse Philip journeyed "toward the south unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza." There he met an official "of Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, who was over all her treasure, who had come to Jerusalem for to worship." Prompted by the Spirit, Philip joined himself to the eunuch's chariot and hearing him reading from Isa. 53, without any proper understanding of its meaning, "beginning from this Scripture, preached unto him Jesus." Convinced that Jesus is the Christ and that it was his duty as a believer to enter into the fellowship of believers and to assume the obligations and responsibilities of discipleship, he desired to receive Christian baptism. Calling the attention of the evangelist to "a certain water" to which they had come, he asked to be baptized. It is related (Acts 8 : 38, 39) that "they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they came up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip." The eunuch "went on his way rejoicing." Philip "was found at Azotus: and passing through preached the gospel to all the cities, till he came to Cæsarea."

II. FROM THE CONVERSION OF SAUL TO THE JERUSALEM CONFERENCE (A. D. 31–46 or 35–49).

1. *The Conversion of Saul.* Not content with laying waste the church in Jerusalem, Saul of Tarsus, the educated Pharisee who had sat at the feet of Gamaliel, and who had received a regular Greek education as well, still "breathing out threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest and asked of him letters to Damascus unto the synagogues, that if he found any that were of the way, whether men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem." In seeking to exterminate the religion of Christ he thought he was rendering service to God; for he was no doubt fully persuaded that its prevalence would mean the subversion of the Law, whose preservation and observance he regarded as supremely important. A man of his intelligence must have learned much of the new religion. Stephen's eloquent discourse may have impressed him; but it had the immediate effect of infuriating him against the innovators, and may have led to a resolution to devote his life to destroying them. We have several varying accounts, all emanating from himself, of his sudden conversion on the road to Damascus (Acts 9, 22, 25). The shining from heaven of a great light, the voice saying, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" his answer, "Who art thou, Lord?" the answer, "I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest," his inquiry what he should do and the Lord's directions, his blindness, his healing and baptism by Ananias of Damascus, the commission given him by the Lord as a "minister and witness," with the promise of Divine protection and support, are the chief items of the narratives. That he regarded the change wrought in him as sudden, and as the direct result of special Divine intervention, admits of no doubt. Almost immediately he began to proclaim Jesus in the synagogues as the Son of God, to the amazement of believers who had known him as a persecutor. "But Saul increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is the Christ" (Acts 9 : 22). The Jews plotted to kill him, but he escaped through the good offices of the disciples, and returned to Jerusalem.

There the brethren were at first afraid of him, but "Barnabas took him and brought him to the apostles," and by narrating the facts of his conversion won their confidence. After preaching in Jerusalem for some time and disputing with the Hellenistic Jews, his life was again in danger, and he was sent by the brethren to Tarsus by way of Cæsarea.

From the Epistle to the Galatians we learn that before his first visit to Jerusalem as a Christian he had gone away into Arabia, and had again returned to Damascus. The stay in Arabia and the second sojourn in Damascus probably occupied more than a year, and the first visit to Jerusalem probably occurred in A. D. 33 or 35.[1]

2. *Peter's Early Ministry*. After the outburst of persecuting fury that followed the martyrdom of Stephen, we are informed that "the church throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria had peace, being builded up; and walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, was multiplied." It is noticeable that the church is still spoken of as a unity though its membership was scattered over several provinces. Peter's ministry and works of healing at Lydda and at Joppa, the two-fold vision by which Cornelius, a God-fearing centurion, was directed to send for Peter, and by which Peter was directed to put aside his Judaizing scruples, and to minister to the centurion at Cæsarea, is remarkable as having opened Peter's eyes to the fact "that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him," and as leading to the first baptism of a Gentile into the Christian fellowship. Peter's Judaizing disposition was to reassert itself, and the brethren at Jerusalem were still to be fully convinced by Paul of the universality of the gospel provision. Peter found some difficulty in justifying his course at Cæsarea to the apostles and brethren in Judea; but when the manifest Divine leading in the matter was made known to them they glorified God.

3. *Evangelization in Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Antioch*. Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Antioch were also evangelized as

---

[1] Ramsay dates this visit A. D. 37, in accordance with his view that Paul's conversion occurred in A. D. 35. Harnack and McGiffert support the earlier dates.

a result of the scattering of the brethren occasioned by "the tribulation that arose about Stephen," and "a great number" are said to have "believed." Barnabas was sent to Antioch to carry forward the good work, and "much people was added unto the Lord." Feeling the need of such help, he "went forth to Tarsus to seek for Saul." Both Barnabas and Saul labored a whole year in this great center. They gathered a church, "taught much people," and here "the disciples were first called Christians" (Acts 11 : 26). There being a famine in Judea the disciples at Antioch, "each man according to his ability," determined to send relief to their suffering brethren. Barnabas and Saul were the agents of their beneficence. The brethren in Judea were suffering at this time from persecution at the hands of Herod as well as from famine. The execution of James the brother of John, and the imprisonment of Peter, who was delivered by angelic ministry, are among the features recorded. After narrating the smiting to death of Herod by the Lord, it is said: "But the word of the Lord grew and multiplied."

Antioch henceforth figures as a great Christian center, side by side with Jerusalem. A church is now spoken of as being there, and among the "prophets and teachers" were "Barnabas, Symeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen the foster-brother of Herod the tetrarch, and Saul." Under the direction of the Holy Spirit, Barnabas and Saul were separated for missionary work and were sent forth whithersoever the Spirit might lead. From the record it would seem that they were designated and sent forth by the "prophets and teachers" whose names have been given, and who are said to have been ministering and fasting when the Divine will was revealed to them; but if this were so, the transaction no doubt had the approval of the entire body of believers.

The death of Herod Agrippa, referred to above, occurred in 44. The first missionary journey of Saul and Barnabas may have begun during the same year. It may be observed that the record of the labors of the apostles during the years 34-44 is exceedingly meagre. It is probable that Paul spent at least ten years in evangelistic work in Syria and Cilicia. It is not at all likely that he and his companions confined themselves closely to Antioch, but their labors were no doubt abundant and widespread. Nothing further is related of Peter and the other apostles until the conference at Jerusalem.

4. *The First Missionary Journey of Paul and Barnabas.* It is noteworthy that the Saul designated as a missionary now becomes Paul in the narrative. This change of name has by some writers been connected with the conversion of the pro-consul Sergius Paulus, on the island of Cyprus, near the beginning of the journey. The better view seems to be that Paul was already his name as a Roman citizen, and that in his missionary work among the Gentiles he preferred this to his Hebrew name. Sailing from Cyprus they landed at Perga, in Pamphylia, some miles from the mouth of the river Cestrus. Thence they journeyed to Antioch in Pisidia, where they visited the synagogue, and on the invitation of the rulers of the synagogue Paul preached with such effect, that "the next Sabbath almost the whole city was gathered together to hear the word of God." The gathering of the multitude aroused the animosity of the Jews, whose blasphemous opposition led the missionaries to turn their attention definitely to the Gentiles, who glorified God that the gospel was for them also; and "as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.'

Driven from Antioch by Jewish persecution, they journeyed to Iconium, leaving behind them a body of disciples "filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost." Here they preached in the synagogue and "a great multitude both of Jews and of Greeks believed." Here Jewish and Gentile opposition was encountered and the missionaries "fled into the cities of Lycaonia, Lystra, and Derbe, and the region round about: and there they preached the gospel" (Acts 14 : 6, 7).

At Lystra, because of the healing of a cripple, the people sought to worship Paul and Barnabas as gods. But they were followed hither by hostile Jews from Antioch and Iconium, a mob was raised against them, and Paul was stoned.

At Derbe they "made many disciples." Then they returning passed through Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, "confirming the souls of the disciples, exhorting them to continue in the faith," warning them of the tribulations that awaited them, "and when they had appointed for them elders in every church and had prayed with fasting, they commended them unto the Lord, on whom they had believed."

On the return journey they preached in Perga, which for some reason they had omitted to do at the beginning of the tour. Thence they returned to Antioch, where they submitted a report of successful work among the Gentiles and remained for a considerable time (Acts 14 : 27, 28).

It is to be remarked that Paul and Barnabas organized the believers in the various towns into churches and appointed elders to look after the spiritual interests of each body. Nothing is said about deacons as officials in these churches. The organization effected was of the simplest kind, elders, after the example of the Jewish synagogues, having been appointed for the direction of Christian life and work. That they should have been appointed by the missionaries and not by the believers themselves was due, no doubt, to the inexperience of these recent believers and their desire that those who had led them to a knowledge of the truth should direct them in the matter of organization. No doubt the apostles appointed those in each case who were known to have the confidence of their brethren, and in all probability the appointments were formally made after full consultation with the churches.

III. FROM THE JERUSALEM CONFERENCE TO THE NERONIAN PERSECUTION (A. D. 47 or 49–64).

From this time onward Paul is the great central figure in the history of the apostolic churches, the Acts of the Apostles being henceforth devoted almost exclusively to the narration of his labors, while the labors of the rest of the apostles are almost wholly lost sight of.

1. *The Conference at Jerusalem.* Either during the absence of Paul and Barnabas in Asia Minor, or shortly after their return, "certain men came down from Judea and taught the brethren, saying, Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved."

This caused not a little disturbance in the church, and to allay strife it was determined that "Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question." They utilized their journey for declaring to the brethren of Phœnicia and Samaria the joyful tidings of the conversion of the Gentiles.

On their arrival in Jerusalem "they were received of the church and the apostles and elders, and they rehearsed all things that God had done with them." Certain Pharisaic believers insisted that these Gentile converts must be circumcised and charged to keep the law of Moses. Peter spoke the decisive word, referring to his own inauguration of Gentile evangelization "a good while ago," and to the fact that Gentile believers had received the Holy Ghost as well as others, and claiming that God made no distinction between them and Jews. He deprecated the thought of putting a yoke upon these brethren. Jews and Gentiles alike are saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus.

Barnabas and Paul then rehearsed "what signs and wonders the Lord had wrought among the Gentiles by them." James, who is commonly regarded as the most Judaizing of the apostles, gave it as his judgment "that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles turn to God, but that we write unto them to abstain from the pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from what is strangled, and from blood." This statement of the case was adopted.

"Then it seemed good to the apostles and the elders, with the whole church, to choose men out of their company and send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas." A letter was drafted containing a rebuke to those who had troubled the Antiochian brethren with words, subverting their souls, recognizing the work of Paul and Barnabas, "men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," mentioning the appointment of Judas and Silas to tell them "the same things by word of mouth," and enumerating the requirements to be made of Gentile believers as formulated by James. The decision of the brethren in conference and the visit of Silas and Judas brought about a good understanding between these two primitive churches. Paul and Barnabas remained for a short time in Antioch, "teaching and preaching the word of the Lord, with many others also."

The conference in Jerusalem is from a historical point of view highly important. It shows us in Jerusalem an organized church, with apostles, elders, and brethren, who act conjointly. So far as appears, the apostles expressed the opinions that prevailed and the elders and brethren assented; but it is probable that all alike were free to express themselves and that the opinion of an unofficial member would have received all the consideration to which it was entitled. We have here an example of inter-congregational intercourse, delegated members of the Antiochian church going to Jerusalem and conferring with the church there, the Jerusalem church in turn appointing representatives to visit the Antiochian church and to explain more fully, if need be, the position of the mother church. Above all, it settled definitely the right of Gentiles to become Christians without passing through Judaism.

For some reason not easily explained, the writer of Acts omits an interesting episode in the history of the relations of the churches of Jerusalem and Antioch. This deficiency is supplied by Paul in Gal. 2 : 11, *seq.*, who also describes the Jerusalem conference more briefly and from a somewhat different point of view (Gal. 2 : 1–10). According to Paul's account, Cephas (Peter) came to Antioch probably some time after the return of Paul and Barnabas with Silas and Judas, and at first ate with the Gentile Christians, but when remonstrated with by certain emissaries of James, "he drew back and separated himself, fearing them that were of the circumcision. And the rest of the Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation." Paul felt obliged to administer a scathing rebuke to his Judaizing brethren and to set forth in vigorous language the equality, nay, the superiority of Gentile to Jewish Christians. On this occasion he seems to have stated in the clearest manner the doctrine of justification by faith as against the doctrine of justification by the works of the law.

It is evident that a new phase of the Gentile question was introduced at this time. Even James had agreed to recognize Gentile Christians on condition that they abstain from certain heathen practices, most of them fundamentally immoral; but it seems to have been tacitly understood at the Jerusalem conference that Jewish Christians should continue to observe the Law. Peter himself was led by his enthusiasm so far to violate the Jewish ceremonial law as to eat with Gentile Christians; but his Jewish prejudices were still strong and he was not ready to break with James, who insisted on the rigorous observance of the Law by Christian Jews.

Paul's uncompromising attitude and stern words of rebuke must have intensified the opposition of the extreme Judaizers and have been irritating even to Peter and Barnabas. Zealous propagandists of the extreme Judaizing position visited the communities in Asia Minor (and no doubt in Cyprus and Phœnicia) that had been evangelized by Paul and Barnabas, denounced Paul as a pretended apostle, and insisted that to be a Christian one must first become a Jew by submitting to circumcision and observing the Jewish ceremonial law.

The Epistle to the Galatians, the aim of which was to counteract this pernicious teaching and to vindicate the writer's character as a divinely chosen apostle of Jesus Christ, was probably written some time after Paul's encounter with Peter and soon after the beginning of the Judaizing propaganda that followed. Objection to the early date on the ground of the intimation in the Epistle that the writer had visited the Galatians more than once (4 : 13), is met by the fact that on the return journey he revisited the communities that had previously been evangelized. The fact that he communicates to the Galatians, as fresh information, the discussions at Jerusalem and Antioch respecting the status of Gentile Christians, bears strongly against the supposition that the Epistle was written after the second missionary journey, in connection with which he could hardly have failed to communicate to them the decisions reached. That the work of the perverters had followed closely upon the conversion of the Galatians through his labors is evident from 1 : 6.

A recent writer, who has devoted years to geographical and archæological research in Asia Minor with special reference to apostolic history,[1] has made it clear that the term Galatia in the apostolic times included not only Galatia proper, but Pisidia, South Phrygia, and Isauria as well. The Galatians addressed in the Epistle would accordingly be the Christians in Antioch of Pisidia, Iconium, Lycaonia, Lystra, and Derbe, the fruits of the first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas.

The Epistle was probably written at Antioch shortly before Paul started on his second missionary journey, about A. D. 46 or 47. The chief objection urged against this early date is the elaborateness of the doctrinal system of the Epistle as compared with that of the Epistles to the Corinthians, and to the Thessalonians written during the second missionary journey. The similarity of its teachings to those of the Epistle to the Romans has inclined critics to place the time of its composition some years later. But it is scarcely to be supposed that the apostle after more than fifteen years of profound occupation with the Christian religion had not yet matured his system. Difference of circumstances in the communities addressed accounts sufficiently for the differences of doctrinal presentation. In this Epistle the apostle had to meet the arguments of determined and unscrupulous Judaizers, and nothing was more natural than that he should set forth clearly and strongly the doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the law.

---

[1] Ramsay, "The Church in the Roman Empire," 1892.

2. *Paul's Second Missionary Journey* (A. D. 46 or 47–49 or 50). Not very long after the Jerusalem conference Paul suggested to Barnabas that they two should revisit the brethren in the cities where they had preached. "Barnabas was minded to take with them John also, who was called Mark." Paul objected, on the ground that on the previous tour Mark had left the party at Perga without a satisfactory reason. "Barnabas took Mark with him and sailed away unto Cyprus; but Paul chose Silas . . . and went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches." What resulted from the journey of Barnabas and Mark we are not informed. Among the incidents of Paul's journey were the revisiting of Derbe and Lystra, the choice of young Timothy as a fellow-laborer, the circumcision of Timothy, whose father was a Greek, "because of the Jews that were in those parts" (Acts 16 : 3), the Divine prohibition to labor in Asia and Bithynia, and the Macedonian appeal in a vision, to which the apostle readily responded.

Philippi was the first Macedonian city to be evangelized. The conversion and baptism of Lydia and her household, the expulsion of the spirit of divination from a Pythoness which led to the beating and imprisonment of Paul and Silas, the opening of the prison doors by an earthquake, the conversion and baptism of the jailer and his family, the fear of the magistrates and their desire to release the missionaries privately, and their confusion when

Paul proclaimed himself a Roman citizen and demanded to be vindicated publicly, are the events recorded. At the request of the magistrates they departed after meeting with the brethren and comforting them.

The relations of Paul to the Philippian church were peculiarly tender. About ten years after the founding of the church, when he was in bonds in Rome, he wrote the church one of the most beautiful of all his letters, on the occasion of their ministering to his needs. It is a personal letter and is not doctrinal in intention; but it is rich in doctrine as well as in practical exhortation. That the organization of the church had been completed by this time is evident from the fact that he addresses the body of believers "with the bishops and deacons." Here in this Gentile church we have a plurality of bishops or overseers, but no "presbyters."

At Thessalonica Paul preached in the synagogue and some Jews believed, "and of the devout Greeks (proselytes) a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few" (Acts 17:4).

Luke gives us a very meagre account of Paul's work in Thessalonica. The apostle supplies further information in the Epistles to the church written about 48 or 49, during his residence at Corinth. After commending their "work of faith and labor of love and patience of hope," their exemplary Christian conduct, and their wholesome influence on other communities, and reminding them of his own zealous, loving, and self-sacrificing labors on their behalf and of his holy, righteous, and unblamable demeanor among them, he refers to his desire to revisit them that had been thwarted by Satan and his sending of Timothy to minister to them while he waited alone at Athens, and concludes with a series of exhortations, suggested no doubt by what Timothy had reported regarding their estate. No doubt there was special occasion for the exhortation to "abstain from fornication," to "study to be quiet," to attend to their secular affairs, laboring with their hands. His eschatological instructions probably grew out of what he had heard regarding their disturbance of mind concerning such matters.

Both Epistles are addressed to the church by Paul and Silvanus and Timothy. The second deals especially with the "coming of our

Lord Jesus, and our gathering together unto him." The Thessalonians had been led by a misunderstanding of the apostle's teachings or through some other influence to regard this coming as "present." He warns them against this error, that was doubtless producing an unwholesome condition in the church, and points out to them, in obscure and mysterious language which they probably understood, that certain great events must precede the *parousia* of the Lord. Here also attention is called to a disposition, doubtless connected with the expectation of the immediate coming of the Lord, to neglect necessary secular labor. He exhorts the Thessalonians to withdraw from every disorderly brother.

Driven from the city through Jewish opposition Paul and Silas went to Berœa, where "the Jews received the word with all readiness of mind, examining the Scriptures daily whether these things were so" (Acts 17 : 11). Jews from Thessalonica followed them and aroused such opposition as to interfere with their labors. Paul proceeded to Athens without Silas and Timothy. While waiting for their arrival "his spirit was provoked within him, as he beheld the city full of idols" (17 : 16). Athens was noted no less for her culture than for the profusion of idolatrous objects within her walls. He found curious and contemptuous listeners in abundance, but few prepared to accept the truth. "But certain men clave unto him, and believed: among whom also was Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them" (17 : 34).

Later tradition was busy with the name of Dionysius, representing him as the first to evangelize France and as the author of a great body of theosophical (Neo-Platonic) writings that really originated about the beginning of the sixth century.

Corinth was the scene of more prolonged and more fruitful labors (*c*. 48–50). It was at this time the principal city of Greece and, from the confluence of Greek, Roman, and Oriental culture and vices, was one of the most cosmopolitan of the cities of eastern Europe and was famous for luxury and vice. The book of Acts informs us (chap. 18) of his arrival, of his association with "a certain Jew named Aquila, a man of Pontus by race, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla, because Claudius had commanded all the Jews to depart from Rome," that as a fellow-craftsman (tent maker) he "abode with them, and they wrought," that "he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded Jews and Greeks;" that opposition and blasphemy on the part of the Jews led him to withdraw from the synagogue and to hold his meetings in the house of a proselyte named Titus Justus; that "Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, believed in the Lord with all his house"; that "many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized"; that he was encouraged by a vision to zeal and persistence; that he "dwelt there a year and six months"; that the Jews rose in might against him and arraigned him before the judgment-seat of Gallio, the proconsul, who refused to pronounce judgment and "drave them from the judgment-seat"; and that, "having tarried after this yet many days," he "took his leave of the brethren, and sailed thence for Syria, and with him Priscilla and Aquila."

From the Epistles to the Corinthians, written the one from Ephesus, the other shortly after his departure from Ephesus (*c.* 51–53), we learn much as to the apostle's feelings in entering upon the work, his methods of presenting the truth there, and the moral and doctrinal difficulties in which the church became involved. Paul bears testimony to the high proficiency that the church had attained "in all utterance and all knowledge," so that they came "behind in no gift." He laments that partisanship has arisen among them, on the basis of attachment to individual workers (Paul, Apollos, Cephas); adjures them "to speak the same thing"; assures them that all the workers are building on the same foundation, Jesus Christ; cautions them against the subtleties of philosophical speculation ("the wisdom of this world"), which there is some reason to suspect Apollos had indulged in and encouraged; refers to a previous letter in which he had warned the Corinthian Christians "to have no company with fornicators"; devotes much attention to various sins of unchastity, the enormity of which the Corinthians very imperfectly realized; lays down the principles to be observed in relation to objects associated with idolatry; gives instructions as regards the conduct and apparel of women in Christian assemblies; calls attention to the diversities of spiritual gifts among believers and to the corporate oneness and multiplicity of function in the membership of the church; exalts love as the cardinal Christian virtue; discusses prophecy and the speaking with tongues, discouraging without absolutely condemning the latter; discusses the resurrection, which he makes fundamental in the Christian system; and urges upon the church a weekly offering for the fund he was collecting for the Jerusalem Christians.

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians indicates that the first had produced the desired effect and that the abuses in the church had been remedied. It abounds in self-vindicatory matter, due no doubt to the efforts of a strong Judaizing party in the church to disparage him and thus destroy his influence. It contains many of the apostle's noblest utterances. He refers to the liberality of the Macedonian churches as an incentive to increased liberality on the part of the Corinthians.

It is probable that the apostle wrote one or more epistles to this church that have not been preserved, and that he was the recipient of written communications from the church. There seems no sufficient reason to see in 2 Cor. 10–13 a separate epistle that has become accidentally incorporated here. Its contents are not such as to fulfill our expectations as regards the lost epistle.

3. *Paul's Third Missionary Journey* (*c*. 50–53). Leaving Corinth in company with Priscilla and Aquila, the apostle made his way eastward. At Ephesus he reasoned with the Jews in the synagogue, but declined to abide. Leaving his companions there and promising to return he sailed for Cæsarea. It is related that "when he had landed at Cæsarea, he went up and saluted the church, and went down to Antioch." It is commonly understood that by "the church" the mother church at Jerusalem is meant. After spending some time there he departed for Ephesus, revisiting the churches in Galatia and Phrygia on the way. If the Epistle to the Galatians was not written during the previous visit to Antioch, as is probable, it was written on this occasion. Between Paul's first and second visits to Ephesus "a certain Jew named Apollos, an Alexandrian by race, a learned man, came to Ephesus, and he was mighty in the Scriptures." We know something of the type of the speculative phi-

losophy and the methods of biblical interpretation in the midst of which he had received his training. He may well have seen and heard the great Philo and could hardly have escaped the influence of his teachings. He had accepted Christ, but was imperfectly instructed in the way of the Lord. He is said to have known only the baptism of John. But Priscilla and Aquila, when they had heard him, "took him unto them and expounded unto him the way of God more carefully," doubtless as they had learned it from Paul. With the good will of the Ephesian brethren he had gone to Achaia, where he was to labor with acceptance and be an occasion of division in the Corinthian church.

On reaching Ephesus Paul found certain other disciples who had received only John's baptism and who knew nothing about the impartation of the Holy Ghost. Instructed by the apostle they "were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus," and when he "had laid his hands upon them the Holy Ghost came upon them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied." Paul now entered upon a period of remarkably successful work, preaching for three months in the synagogue and afterward, by reason of opposition, in "the school of Tyrannus." Here his labors continued for two years (*c.* 50–52), "so that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks." The healing of the sick and the casting out of demons caused fear to fall upon Jews and Greeks alike, "and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified." Some who had practised magic brought their books, whose value was estimated at fifty thousand pieces of silver, and publicly burned them. "So mightily grew the word of the Lord and prevailed."

As the apostle was about to leave Ephesus with the view of revisiting the churches in Macedonia and Achaia, a riot was raised against the Christians, led by the idol-makers, whose trade had been seriously interfered with by the prevalence of the word of God. This was promptly put down by the authorities, who feared the censure of the Roman government. In Ephesus was a great temple of Diana, and the idol-makers sought to arouse the multitude by crying, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians."

Having taken an affectionate leave of the brethren Paul journeyed to Macedonia and passed thence to Greece, visiting and exhorting the churches he had founded. It was during his stay in Macedonia that he wrote Second Corinthians. Corinth was probably his headquarters during the three months spent in Greece (Acts 20 : 3), and it was doubtless there that "the plot" was "laid against him by the Jews." While there he wrote the Epistle to the Romans (*c.* 53), in which more fully than elsewhere he expounds his conception of Christian truth in its relations to Judaism. The church addressed was no doubt prevailingly Gentile, but had a not inconsiderable Jewish minority. He had long desired to visit Rome and enter into personal relations with the Christians there. It was his plan at this time, after visiting Jerusalem with the collections that he had taken great pains to gather, to proceed to Rome, and to be set forward by the brethren there on a missionary tour to the farther west.

Several German critics (Schultz, Weizsäcker, Jülicher, *et al.*) and a recent American writer (Dr. McGiffert) are of the opinion that chap. 16, containing the salutations, was originally addressed not to the Roman church but to the Ephesian. It is thought that the apostle could hardly be expected to know intimately so large a number of the Roman Christians and to be familiar even with their household meeting-places before he had ever set foot in Rome. The presence there of Priscilla and Aquila, whom we last left at Ephesus, would suggest this transfer of the chapter. But there is nothing inherently improbable in supposing that these devoted Christian workers should have returned to Rome, whence they had been driven some years before, or that many other of Paul's converts in the East had removed to the great metropolis. Supposing this to have been the case the apostle might well have learned through these many particulars about the Roman church.

Returning through Macedonia he sailed from Philippi to Troas, accompanied by a number of the brethren. At Troas, "upon the first day of the week," the brethren "were gathered together to break bread." Paul, intending to leave the next day, discoursed until midnight and restored the young man who from drowsiness had fallen from the third story. "From Miletus he sent to Ephesus and called to him the elders of the church." His farewell charge, in which he warned them that grievous wolves would enter in among them, not sparing the flock, assured them that for himself he expected bonds and imprisonment and that they should see his face no more, and tenderly exhorted them to take heed unto themselves and all the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them bishops, is probably the most pathetic of all his recorded utterances. At Cæsarea he was entertained by Philip, the evangelist, who abode there and was probably at the head of the local church. He had four daughters who had the gift of prophecy. At Tyre and at Cæsarea Paul was warned prophetically of the fate that awaited him in Jerusalem (Acts 21 : 8–14).

It would seem that by this time Paul's work among the Gentiles had become so widely known and Jewish hostility toward him had become so acute that a violent outbreak against him might be expected in Jerusalem. But he was "ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus Christ."

4. *Paul's Last Visit to Jerusalem and the Cæsarean Imprisonment* (*c.* 54–56). In Jerusalem the brethren received Paul and his companions gladly. In conference with James and the elders he "rehearsed one by one the things that God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry." They rejoiced in what had been accomplished, but referring to the fact that "the many thousands" "among the Jews of them that believed" were "all zealous for the law," and that he was reported to be teaching "all the Jews that" were "among the Gentiles to forsake Moses," they asked him to demonstrate his Jewish loyalty by undergoing, with others, a purifying ceremony. This he did. But Jews from Asia who knew of his work among the Gentiles raised an outcry against him when they saw him in the temple, charging that he had defiled the temple by bringing Greeks into it. Rescued from the mob by the Roman officials, he attempted to vindicate himself by rehearsing his religious history. When he came to his divine commission to preach to the Gentiles, the mob raised an outcry and demanded his life. Brought into the castle by order of the chief captain, he was about to be scourged, but he asserted his Roman citizenship and was spared this indignity (Acts 22).

The next day the chief captain called "the chief priests and all the Jewish council" (Sanhedrin) together "and brought Paul down and set him before them." When he was about to make his defense the high priest Ananias ordered that he be smitten on the mouth. This aroused his indignation and led him as a Pharisee to appeal to the Pharisees. By this means he set the two Jewish parties by the ears, and the chief captain had Paul taken back to the castle for protection. Jewish malignity had reached its height. A number of zealots "bound themselves under a curse, saying that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul."

Informed of the plot by his nephew, Paul induced the chief captain to send him with a strong guard to Felix, the governor at Cæsarea. Felix, a corrupt and licentious official, had little sympathy with the Jews, and yet he dared not antagonize them by liberating his great prisoner. He was willing, along with his immoral consort, to hear the apostle preach, but not to abandon his vicious life. For two years he allowed Paul to lie in prison (Acts 24 : 27).

Felix was superseded by Porcius Festus at the end of this time. The new governor reheard the case and submitted it to King Agrippa, who permitted Paul to speak in his own defense. Agrippa and Festus would probably have released Paul, but he had appealed unto Cæsar and they felt that he had thus placed himself outside of their jurisdiction (Acts 26 : 32).

5. *Paul's Voyage to Rome and his Roman Imprisonment* (56–59). The perilous voyage to Rome in charge of the centurion, Julius, the shipwreck and sojourn at Melita, and the arrival at Rome, are related in a very realistic way, probably by Luke himself, who was an eye-witness of much of the later missionary work of the apostle. The journey to Rome probably occurred about A. D. 56–57. The writer of Acts relates that in Rome "Paul was suffered to abide by himself with the soldier that guarded him;" that he summoned to his lodgings the chief of the Jews and explained to them the cause of his imprisonment; that he denied having done anything against the Jewish people or the customs of the fathers; that he sought to convince them from the Law of the

truth of the gospel; and that he "abode two whole years in his own hired dwelling, and received all that went in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God and teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness, none forbidding him." Neither this writer nor any other New Testament writer gives us any further information about the fate of the apostle. Yet it is probable that no period of his ministry was more fruitful than these two years in Rome.

The Epistles to the Colossians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, Philemon, and Second Timothy were probably all written during this time. In Ephesians 6 : 18–20 he asks his readers to pray that utterance may be given unto him in opening his mouth, to make known with boldness the mystery of the gospel, for which he was "an ambassador in chains." In Philippians he rejoices in the gifts received from his Macedonian brethren and conveys to them the salutation of all the Roman saints, especially of them that are of the household of Cæsar (Phil. 4 : 21, 22), and expresses the hope that he may soon be permitted to visit them. In Philemon he speaks of himself as "Paul the aged, and now a prisoner also of Jesus Christ" and as having begotten Onesimus, the runaway slave, in his bonds. He expresses a wish that Onesimus might be permitted to minister to him. In Second Timothy he speaks of Onesiphorus as having often refreshed him, as not having been ashamed of his chain, but as having sought out and found him when he was in Rome. He urges Timothy to come to him shortly, states that Demas forsook him, "having loved this present world," that Alexander the coppersmith did him much evil, and that at his "first defense" all forsook him. Yet he rejoices that the Lord stood by him and strengthened him, that through him "the message might be fully proclaimed, and that all the Gentiles might hear." He had been "delivered out of the mouth of the lion." He asked Timothy to bring his cloak, books, and parchments left at Troas.

If Paul's two years of Roman imprisonment occurred 57–59, as seems probable, and if he suffered martyrdom in the great Neronian persecution in the summer of A. D. 64, as is commonly supposed, we have an interval of five years without known events. The silence of Acts regarding his liberation or his martyrdom is difficult to explain. If he was liberated about A. D. 59, it may be that from age and suffering he was physically incapable of further missionary labors, and that he remained among the Roman Christians till the great persecution, or he may have carried out his earlier purpose to preach the gospel in the farther west. Clement of Rome in his Epistle to the Corinthians (*c.* 95) mentions the martyrdom of Paul and Peter together as belonging to his own generation, though he says nothing of time or place. Origen and Tertullian (beginning of the third century) represent Paul as suffering martyrdom at Rome under Nero. Harnack, denying the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles in their present form, holds that after Paul's liberation he produced the genuine writings that lie at the basis of these Epistles. This theory involves the supposition that he visited Asia Minor during the interval. The absence of a record of Paul's labors during the years 59–64 is far from proving that no such labors found place. The Pastoral Epistles, as genuine writings of the apostle, can be best acaccounted for by supposing a somewhat prolonged interval between his Roman imprisonment and his martyrdom and another visit to Asia Minor. From 2 Timothy, probably addressed to Timothy at Ephesus, Aquila and Priscilla appear to have been in Ephesus. If they were in Rome when the Epistle to the Romans was written, they may have returned to Ephesus at the time of the Neronian persecution. On this theory the notices regarding imprisonment in the Pastoral Epistles would refer to a second Roman imprisonment of the apostle preceding his martyrdom.

6. *Peter's Career from the Apostolic Conference Onward* (47–64). The book of Acts is strangely silent regarding the later activity of the apostle of the circumcision, and we possess but little information from any other source. In First Corinthians Paul refers to a party in the church that made his name their watchword and he speaks of him (9 : 5) as accompanied on his journeys by a believing wife. It is probable that for a number of years he devoted most of his time to mission work among the Jews of Syria, returning occasionally to Jerusalem. Toward the end of his career he may have occupied himself more largely with Gentile work.

The first of the Epistles that bear his name is pronounced by modern critics thoroughly Pauline in tone. That his Jewish prejudices should have gradually given way in view of the great work among the Gentiles accomplished by Paul and that he should have read with diligence the Epistles of that great thinker is not inconceivable ; and there is no difficulty in supposing that his less original mind should have become imbued with

Pauline modes of thought. That he should have chosen Rome as the sphere of his latest labors, where the Christians were prevailingly Gentile and where Paul had for some years lived and labored, would strongly confirm the view that his conceptions of Christianity had become assimilated to those of Paul.

Recent criticism is almost unanimous in maintaining that Peter closed his career in Rome, suffering martyrdom under Nero in 64. The absence of any mention of Peter's presence in Paul's Epistles written from his Roman prison is thought to be against the supposition that Peter's ministry in Rome had begun at that time; but if Peter reached Rome about A. D. 59, the date of Paul's supposed release, sufficient time would be allowed for him to gain the large influence in the city that tradition ascribes to him.

It is not improbable that during Paul's imprisonment (Cæsarea and Rome) Peter should have felt prompted to visit the churches of Asia Minor now deprived of Paul's ministry. The address of Peter to "the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," presupposes such a visit on the part of the author. Silvanus and Mark, Paul's earlier companions, are associated with him at the time of writing. Mark was with Paul during his Roman imprisonment. The salutation at the close from "the (church) that is in Babylon," as it is commonly understood, would seem to indicate that the letter was written from Rome, the symbolical Babylon, especially as nothing is known of a church in Babylon at that time, and it is improbable that Silvanus and Mark labored in Mesopotamia.

The First Epistle was chiefly consolatory in view of the then present tribulations, and hortatory against current forms of vice and irreligion and in favor of obedience to constituted authority (to the king as supreme, to governors, to masters on the part of servants, to husbands on the part of wives), likemindedness, compassion, brotherly love, humble-mindedness, patience, and rejoicing in being partakers of Christ's sufferings. The author speaks of Christ as "the Shepherd and Bishop" of the souls of believers, and of himself as "a fellow-elder" with the elders of the churches.

The Second Epistle consists of exhortation to the practice of Christian virtues, of a severe arraignment of certain immoral forms of error, and of a remarkable eschatological passage in which "the day of the Lord" is represented as coming "as a thief," in which "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat," to be followed by "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." The writer refers, in support of this representation, to the Epistles of his "beloved brother Paul, wherein are some things hard to be understood, which the ignorant and unsteadfast wrest, as they do all the other Scriptures, to their own destruction."

This Epistle did not gain general recognition as a genuine work of Peter and as a canonical book until after the time of Eusebius (*c.* 325), but its useful character had caused it to be widely read and led to its ultimate reception into the canon. The chief objections to its genuineness are that no mention of it in Christian literature occurs before the third century; that, like the Epistle of Jude, to which it bears a striking resemblance, it combats forms of Gnostic heresy supposed to be of a later origin; that it refers to Paul's writings as "Scripture"; and the seeming remoteness of its composition from the early Christian time as implied in 3 : 4. But it is probable that the "Fathers" referred to are the ancient Jewish patriarchs, and there is no feature of the heresy combated that might not have arisen before 64. Even supposing the author to have been dependent on the Epistle of Jude a later date is not necessary. If the First Epistle is genuine and bears evidence of strong Pauline influence, the mention of Paul's Epistles among the "Scriptures" would not be unnatural.

Early tradition, gathered up by Papias (A. D. 140–160) represented Peter as the virtual author of the Gospel according to Mark. It is highly probable that Mark wrote under the influence of Peter and recorded the words and deeds of the Saviour as Peter was accustomed to narrate them.

Several apocryphal works, written in the second century, bear Peter's name (the Preaching of Peter, the Gospel of Peter, the Apocalypse of Peter), and he figures very prominently in the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions (end of second century).

There is no ground for the later Roman Catholic contention that Peter was the first pastor of the Roman church, or that he occupied a position of primacy among the apostles, although our Lord's address to Peter recorded in Matt. 16 : 18, 19, wrongly interpreted, could be easily perverted in this interest.

7. *The Ministry of James, the Brother of Jesus.* There is no evidence that the brothers of Jesus believed in his Messiahship until after his resurrection. A special manifestation to him of the risen Christ no doubt made of James the zealous disciple that we find him to have been. After Peter had become occupied with missionary work outside of the city, and especially after he had compromised himself in the eyes of the Judaizing Christians by eating with Gentile Christians, James came to be the recognized leader of the mother-church. It does not appear that he ever abandoned the contention that it is obligatory on Christian Jews to observe the Law. While he countenanced missionary work among the Gentiles and agreed to the recognition of Gentile converts without circumcision, as a Jew he felt bound to observe the whole law and to require other Jewish converts to conform to this practice. That the mother-church, of which James remained pastor until his death, enjoyed immunity from the severer forms of persecution may be inferred from absence of any notices of suffering; that the Christians of Jerusalem were exceedingly poor is evident from the continued efforts of Paul to gather funds for their relief. Later Christian writers (Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, etc.) represent James as the "bishop" of the Jerusalem church; but this term is never applied to him in the apostolic writings. The authority he enjoyed was due not to official position but rather to force of character, relationship to the Lord, and stanch adherence to Judaism. According to an early tradition embodied by Hegesippus in the fifth book of his "Memoirs," and quoted by Eusebius,[1] James had attained to an extraordinary reputation for sanctity among the Jews and had received the titles "the just" and "bulwark of the people." He is said to have been "holy from his mother's womb," to have drunk "no wine nor strong drink," to have eaten no flesh, to have never had his hair or beard cut, and to have abstained from anointing himself with oil and from bathing. "He alone was permitted to enter into the holy place; for he wore not woolen but linen garments."

---

[1] "Church History," Bk. II., ch. 23.

It is represented that after Paul had been delivered out of their hands and sent to Rome, some of the leaders of the Jews questioned James about Jesus and that his confession led to the conversion of so many as to alarm the authorities, who cast him from the pinnacle of the temple and afterward stoned and beat him to death. Josephus relates that advantage was taken of the interregnum between the death of Festus and the arrival of Albinus to destroy this just man. The high priest Annas is said to have called the Sanhedrin together and secured his condemnation. This occurred about A. D. 61.

8. *The Labors of Other Apostolic Men.* We know almost nothing of the career of John from the time of the apostolic conference, when Paul reckoned him as one of the "pillars" of the Jerusalem church, to the Neronian persecution. It is probable that long before A. D. 64 he had entered upon his missionary work in the province of Asia. But his writings and the most that we know of his labors are of a later date. To Jude, a brother of the Lord, a short canonical Epistle is ascribed. He probably remained in connection with the Jerusalem church. Early tradition, of uncertain value, represents Andrew, Matthew, and Bartholomew as laboring in the region of the Black Sea; Thomas, Thaddeus, and Simon the Canaanite in the remote East as far as India, and Philip in Asia Minor. We have no trustworthy accounts of the results of their labors or of the dates or circumstances of their deaths.

According to tradition Mark labored in Egypt and founded the church in Alexandria. As he was with Paul during his Roman imprisonment and with Peter when he composed his first Epistle, and as he is said to have been succeeded in Alexandria by Annianus in the eighth year of Nero (62), his residence there must have included some time before 62. If he composed the Gospel that bears his name under Peter's influence it was probably shortly before the Neronian persecution.

Of Barnabas after his separation from Paul we know nothing except that he labored for a time on the island of Cyprus. The Epistle to the Hebrews, written probably after the Neronian persecution, was ascribed by Tertullian and by many later writers to Barnabas.

Of Apollos, the learned Alexandrian Jew, whose labors in Ephesus and in Corinth have already been referred to, nothing further is known. Luther ascribed to him the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and this opinion has been adopted by a number of recent writers.

Of Luke, "the beloved physician" and the author of the Gospel bearing his name and of the book of Acts, who was closely associated with Paul in his missionary labors and during his imprisonment, nothing further is known. Some early Christian writers supposed that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written in Hebrew by Paul and translated into Greek by Luke. Origen was of the opinion that the Epistle is a report of oral teachings of Paul by one of his disciples, possibly by Luke, and some have attributed its authorship to Luke. The late Dr. John A. Broadus inclined to the opinion that the Epistle was a sermon of Paul's reported freely in his own language by Luke.

Of Silvanus the last mention we have is in First Peter. Timothy, who was so intimately associated with Paul in his missionary labors, who joined with Paul in the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, and Philemon, and who was with him during part of his Roman imprisonment, seems to have labored for some time in Ephesus, and is represented by a somewhat late tradition as a bishop of that church. He is said to have suffered martyrdom under Domitian. The name of Titus is associated in tradition with the island of Crete.

V. FROM THE NERONIAN PERSECUTION TO THE DEATH OF THE APOSTLE JOHN (A. D. 64-100).

1. *The Neronian Persecution.* Christianity had from the beginning everywhere suffered persecution, the Jews being usually the instigators. It has been noticed that in most cases Roman officials were slow to act upon Jewish accusations and gave a measure of protection to the Christians. In a few cases pagans raised an outcry against those whose teachings were perilous to their worldly interests. But there is no instance on record in which any high Roman official proceeded spontaneously against the Christians before A. D. 64. Claudius had issued an edict of banishment against the Jews of Rome

(probably in A. D. 49). No doubt such Jewish Christians as were in Rome suffered along with other Jews. The remark of Suetonius, that "Claudius expelled the Jews assiduously creating disturbance under the instigation of Chrestus," has led some to suspect that the Jewish riots were connected with the Christian propaganda. But Chrestus may have been a Jewish agitator of the time. Supposing Christ to be meant, it is by no means certain that the writer made the blunder of supposing that he was then actually present in Rome.

The early years of Nero's reign were not unfavorable to the spread of the gospel. Son of the ambitious and intriguing Agrippina and stepson of the imbecile Emperor Claudius, he succeeded to the imperial dignity while still a youth. Gifted in poetry and in music, genial, humane, the beginning of his reign awakened high expectations. Augustus had esteemed it a personal affliction to be obliged to punish, and he had inflicted the death penalty only in extreme cases. The youthful Nero, some time after his assumption of the purple, rejoiced that in his entire empire not a drop of blood had been shed. When it appeared necessary for him to sign death warrants he lamented that he could write. Under the tuition of such philosophers and statesmen as Seneca and Burrhus it was expected that the ingenuous youth would become a paragon of wisdom and of justice. Seneca thought him "incapable of learning cruelty," and expected that the emperor's gentleness of disposition would permeate the entire empire and so transform the world as to restore the innocent, golden age of mankind. Nero was emperor when Rom. 13 : 1–7 and 1 Peter 11 : 13–17 were penned. It was to Nero that Paul as a Roman citizen appealed when arraigned in Cæsarea. Christianity had its representatives, doubtless somewhat numerous and influential, in Nero's household.

It does not fall within the purpose of the present work to attempt to account for the transformation of the brilliant, ingenuous Nero of 54 into the cruel monster of 62–68. As early as A. D. 55 he had ordered the murder of his brother Britannicus, and in A. D. 60 his mother had been assassinated at his command. The divorce and the subsequent murder of his first wife Octavia and the death of Poppœa, his second wife, from personal abuse represent stages in his downward career. He became insanely greedy of praise for his poetic and musical accomplishments, and to gain the popular applause often played the part of a public buffoon. Unbridled indulgence in vice of every description, the flattery of corrupt favorites, and the possession of unlimited power, no doubt dethroned his reason. Only a madman could have been guilty of the follies and the atrocities of his later years.

In the summer of 64 his fury was turned upon the Christians of Rome. The occasion was the burning of ten out of fourteen of the precincts of the city. For accounts of the conflagration and of the persecution that ensued we are indebted almost wholly to pagan writers of the next century. Contemporary Jewish writers like Josephus were discreetly silent regarding the conflagration and the persecution alike. Christians were terror-stricken by this terrible revelation of the "mystery of iniquity," and if they referred to the matter at all veiled their utterances in symbolical language. The abruptness with which the book of Acts terminates may have been due to the writer's unwillingness to subject his brethren to further persecution by publicly narrating the facts of the Neronian persecution. The Apocalypse no doubt owes some of its obscurity to the desire of its writer to express in a way intelligible to the Christians of his time, but unintelligible to their enemies, his divinely inspired views on the actual and future relations of Christianity and the great world-power.

Suetonius, Dion Cassius, and Pliny state categorically that Nero himself was the author of the conflagration. Tacitus informs us that Nero was suspected of the crime and that to avert from himself the suspicion he accused the Christians of committing it. Tacitus' account of the persecution is as follows:

> First were arraigned those who confessed, then on their information a vast multitude were convicted, not so much on the charge of arson as for their hatred of the human race. Their deaths were made more cruel by the mockery that accompanied them. Some were covered with the skins of wild beasts and torn to pieces by dogs; others perished on the cross or in the flames; and others again were burnt after sunset as torches to light up the darkness

Nero himself granted his gardens for the show, and gave an exhibition in the circus, and dressed as a charioteer, mixed with the people or drove his chariot himself. Thus, guilty and deserving the severest punishment as they were, they were yet pitied, as they seemed to be put to death, not for the benefit of the State, but to gratify the cruelty of an individual.[1]

The following remarks may be apposite:

(1) Nero's reputation for wanton destructiveness of property and life was such as to lead to the popular belief that he had caused the conflagration and had inflicted the most terrible suffering on a sect innocent of this particular crime, but on other accounts hated by the people. It is probable that Nero had expressed dissatisfaction with the architecture of the city and that this, together with the magnificence of the rebuilding, confirmed the suspicion.

(2) It is probable that his attention to the Christians as proper victims was suggested by the Jews, who enjoyed considerable favor under Nero through the influence still possessed by the beautiful Poppœa.

(3) We are not to infer from Nero's proceedings against the Christians that he proscribed Christianity as such; but rather that he proscribed the Christians of Rome as guilty of incendiarism and of disgraceful practices.

(4) Tacitus's statement that "first were arraigned those who confessed" may mean either that pretended Christians were found who testified that Christians were guilty of arson and other crimes, and who gave the names of many Christians, or that some real Christians were forced by torture to confess crimes that they had not committed and to give the names of their brethren, or that the accused ones first arraigned confessed that they were Christians. From Tacitus' own statement it would seem that the confession did not involve the admission of incendiarism, but rather of such views of life as seemed to the Romans to involve "hatred of the human race." Their repudiation of the State religion and their refusal to participate in the corrupt social life of the time sufficed to bring upon them this charge, and vile stories were commonly circulated against them, if not in the time of Nero, certainly by the time of Tacitus.

---

[1] "Annals," XV., 44.

(5) There is no reason to suppose that Nero attempted to exterminate Christianity throughout the empire by issuing a general edict against the Name. Yet it is probable that the harsh treatment of Christians in Rome encouraged their enemies in Asia Minor and elsewhere to rise up against them, and caused Roman officials in the provinces to be less indifferent than hitherto to charges brought against Christians.

(6) It is probable that throughout the remainder of his reign Nero continued to cause the persecution of Christians in Rome. It is not necessary to suppose that Paul and Peter were both, or either of them, executed in the summer of 64. If there were reasons for believing that either of them lived till 66 or 68 the fact that both suffered in Rome under Nero would not be contradicted.

2. *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (*c.* A. D. 67). The six years ~~that~~ intervened between the Neronian persecution and the destruction of Jerusalem must have been a time of gloom and grave apprehension to the Christian churches. They had come to realize that they could expect nothing but evil from the constituted authorities. Many Jewish Christians, who from the first had found it difficult to reconcile the doctrine and the fact of a suffering Saviour with their ideas of a Messianic kingdom and to whom the future seemed fraught with suffering, began to grow discouraged. The Epistle to the Hebrews was probably written at this time with a view to making clear the necessity and the dignity of a suffering Messiah. Christ's superiority to Jewish high priests consists in the fact that "having learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation" (5 : 8, 9). "It behooved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest. . . For in that he hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." Reference is made in chap. 10 to "former days," in which the readers "endured a great conflict of sufferings," and "took joyfully the spoiling of their goods." The blessedness of faith, exercised under the most trying circumstances, and the glories of martyrdom are impressively set forth. The

readers are warned against "divers and strange teachings," and the words that follow indicate that it is Judaizing error (Ebionism) that the writer has in mind. They are exhorted to "obey them that have the rule over" them. A salutation from the brethren in Italy is conveyed and the release of Timothy from bondage is reported. If Paul's martyrdom did not occur in the summer of 64, but somewhat later, the Epistle may have been written under his direction and may be virtually his own. In any case it is thoroughly Pauline in spirit.

3. *The Jewish War and the Destruction of Jerusalem* (A. D. 70). The New Testament contains no direct reference to this great event which forms an epoch in Jewish history and exerted a profound influence on Christian progress. "One of the most awful eras in God's economy of grace, and the most awful revolution in all God's religious dispensations," is Warburton's characterization. "A greater catastrophe than the mortal combat of the Jewish people with the Roman world-power, and the destruction of the holy city, is unknown to the history of the world" (Orelli). Farrar characterizes this event as "the most awful in history."

For years Jewish discontent with Roman tyranny had been growing more and more acute. Caligula (*c.* 40) ordered his image to be erected in the Jewish temple, and committed the execution of the order to Petronius, the Syrian governor. The determined opposition of the Jews led to delay and a crisis was averted by the death of the emperor (41). Claudius sought to conciliate the Jews of Palestine and of Egypt by guaranteeing to them freedom and protection in the exercise of their religion, and the Herodian kingdom under Agrippa I. was restored so as to cover the territory governed by Herod the Great. After his death (44) Judea became a Roman province and the authority of the later Herodians was very slight.

The Roman procurators (44 onward) were for the most part corrupt and oppressive and were little concerned about conciliating the people. Felix (*c.* 52–58), an emancipated slave, was licentious and dishonest and gave the Jewish people over to be ruined by unscrupulous tax-gatherers. Festus (*c.* 58–61) bore a better reputation;

but Albinus, his successor (*c.* 61), shamefully plundered the land. "There was no sort of iniquity that he did not practise" (Josephus). He shared with robbers in their spoils and ranked among them as a captain (Josephus). His successor Florus (*c.* 65) was so shameless in his corruption that he is represented by Josephus as fomenting revolution in order to cover up his misdeeds.

In 66 a Jewish uprising occurred in Cæsarea. The plundering of the temple by Florus greatly increased the popular discontent. Jewish zealots here and there marshaled armies against Roman rule. The slaughter of twenty thousand Jews in Cæsarea was a signal for a general uprising. About thirteen thousand fell shortly afterward at Scythopolis and multitudes in other places. Vespasian, an experienced general, was sent by Nero in 67 to quell the rebellion. Jerusalem was strongly fortified and was able for a long time to resist the Roman assaults. The death of Nero led to a suspension of effort. Galba, Otho, and Vitellius successively donned the purple, but it remained for Vespasian to secure general recognition as emperor (69).

With Vespasian it was a matter of honor to complete the subjugation of the Jews. His son Titus, with an army of eighty thousand, besieged Jerusalem in A. D. 70. Josephus, the historian, took sides with the Romans against his own people and co-operated with Titus. His writings constitute the only detailed account we possess of this terrible struggle.

Besides the ordinary population of Jerusalem hundreds of thousands of Jews had flocked to the city from Judea, Syria, and even Mesopotamia. The besieged held out with fanatical obstinacy. The horrors of famine, pestilence, and cannibalism were added to the destructive fury of the Roman army. As one part of the city after another fell into the hands of the Romans the inhabitants were remorselessly executed. Over a million are said to have been slaughtered and over a hundred thousand to have been taken captive. Multitudes were sent into the most degrading slavery. Thousands of the choicest young men were selected for gladiatorial exhibitions. The temple was destroyed, although Titus is said to have wished to preserve it. A few of the Zealots escaped and proceeded to Alexandria, where they caused a Jewish insurrection. This was suppressed with great slaughter and the temple at Leontopolis was forever closed against the Jews. The Jewish nation as a theocracy was blotted out of existence.

There is reason to believe that the Christians of Jerusalem and Judea were strongly opposed to the Zealots in their uncompromising warfare against Rome. To remain in Jerusalem would subject them not only to the horrors of the siege and to the general massacre that they must have foreseen as inevitable, but to maltreatment at the hands of the Zealots, who could brook no opposition and to whom even indifference in respect to the patriotic cause was regarded as treason. Shortly before the city had been invested by Titus (probably late in 69) they withdrew to Pella, in Perea, where under the leadership of Symeon, a cousin of the Lord, they remained until it was safe for them to return to Jerusalem. Under the leadership of James the Jerusalem Christians had gloried in being Jews and in rigorously observing the Jewish ceremonial law. In fact they claimed that, having accepted the Messiah rejected by most of their fellow-countrymen, they were the only true Jews; and they no doubt lived in the hope that they would be able to lead the nation as such to accept the Messiah.

The destruction of Jerusalem was of momentous import to Christianity in the following ways:

(1) It marked in the most unmistakable way the end of the old dispensation and the complete emancipation of Christianity from the thraldom of Judaism. It was henceforth impossible for any one to observe the ceremonial law in its fullness. No doubt the Pauline type of Christianity would ultimately have become dominant apart from this fearful interposition of Divine Providence. Judaistic Christianity was to persist in the form of sects, but catholic Christianity could no longer be Judaizing.

(2) The destruction of the city was very commonly looked upon by Christians as a divine judgment on the Jewish people for their rejection and crucifixion of the Messiah. It may safely be said that if the Jews as a body, or a large proportion of them, had accepted Christ

as their Saviour and had become partakers of the Spirit of Christ, the Jewish Zealots, who brought ruin upon their people, would not have arisen or would not have secured popular support.

(3) The great catastrophe may be regarded as a direct fulfillment of our Lord's predictions as recorded in Matt. 21 : 43 and 23 : 37–39, and in Luke 21 : 20–28.

(4) This great event is regarded by many as a fulfillment of our Lord's prophecies regarding his speedy coming in his kingdom (Matt. 10 : 23 ; 16 : 28 ; 24 : 34), and of such passages in the apostolic Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles as represent the Lord's advent as imminent. It seems harsh to associate so glorious an event as the Lord's coming with a catastrophe so terrible ; yet there can be no question but that the destruction of the city and the theocracy gave a freedom and a universality to the gospel which mark an epoch in the history of Christianity and placed the gradually advancing kingdom of Christ on a firm basis.

(5) There is no reason to think that the Roman authorities at this time discriminated carefully between Christianity and Judaism in favor of the former ; but the time had past when the accusations of Jews against Christians would be heeded by the civil courts. Henceforth the Jews were without political influence and were treated with contempt by the Roman officials.

4. *The Gospels.* All the Gospels except that of Mark (65–70) were probably composed after the destruction of Jerusalem. Various collections of discourses and narratives of the life and works of Jesus had doubtless been in circulation for several decades. Matthew's Gospel was probably composed shortly after A. D. 70, Luke's Gospel and his Acts of the Apostles probably a few years later, while the Gospel according to John did not appear until near the close of the century.

5. *Persecution of Christians under Domitian* (A. D. 81–96). Vespasian (69–79) does not appear to have taken any steps against the Christians. He was one of the best of the emperors and devoted his attention largely to the proper work of administration and to the erection of useful public works. Having slaughtered a million rebellious Jews and destroyed their city and sanctuary, he

relented toward the subjugated remnant and on various occasions protected them from local tyranny. Jews and Christians alike were compelled to pay the old temple tax for the maintenance of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus that had been erected in Jerusalem. Christians were apparently little thought of except as a small Jewish sect hated by their countrymen and not at all dangerous to the commonwealth. The same is true of the short reign of Titus (79–81).

Domitian (81–96), son of Vespasian and Flavia Domitilla, was autocratic, arrogant, suspicious, cruel, and ferocious. Vespasian had refused to be worshiped as God. Domitian insisted upon such worship as an imperial prerogative, and assumed the titles "God," "Lord and God," "Jupiter," etc. He was zealous for the maintenance of the State religion and regarded secret religious societies as hotbeds of treason which must be destroyed. He became suspicious of the Senate, which opposed his arbitrary measures, and many of its members were proscribed. He instituted a system of espionage and encouraged slaves to betray their masters. During the last two years of his reign his suspiciousness and cruelty became intensified. Christians, especially those in Rome, suffered severely at his hands. Christianity now had its representatives among the Roman aristocracy. Flavia Domitilla (the younger), wife (or niece) of Flavius Clemens, a consul and a cousin of the emperor, is said to have been "exiled with others to the island of Pontia in consequence of testimony borne to Christ."[1] Flavius Clemens himself was put to death, but whether as a Christian remains uncertain. Suetonius charges him with "most contemptible laziness" and Dion Cassius with "atheism." This latter was a common charge against Christians; but we cannot account for the silence of early Christian tradition if so eminent a man had suffered for the faith.

2d Per

✓ Domitian is said to have heard that relatives of Jesus still lived in Palestine and to have suspected them of kingly aspirations. When they had been brought before him and he had learned that they were poor rustics and that the kingdom of Christ "was not a temporal nor an earthly," "but a heavenly and angelic one, which would appear at the end of the world," he "let them go, and by a decree put a stop to the persecution of the church."[1] Tertullian speaks of Domitian as "a portion of Nero as regards cruelty," and he seems to have been regarded by the author of the Apocalypse as a second Nero (17 : 11). The First Epistle of Clement of Rome, written about this time, speaks of "sudden and repeated calamities and adversities" as having recently befallen the Roman church. The banishment of the Apostle John to Patmos is commonly referred to this reign. It is not at all likely that Domitian attempted to institute a general persecution of Christians; but the persecution for local reasons of the Roman Christians and the emperor's known hostility to Christianity doubtless gave encouragement to persecuting acts in many communities.

---

[1] Eusebius.

6. *The Johannean Apocalypse.* According to Irenæus, whose acquaintance with Polycarp of Smyrna (d. 155), a disciple of the Apostle John, placed him in very close touch with the later apostolic age, the Apocalypse was written near the end of the reign of Domitian (*c.* 95). More than any other New Testament writing it breathes a spirit of intense hostility to the Roman Empire. Domitian seems to have been regarded as a repetition of Nero. His arrogance, his determination to be recognized and worshiped as a god, and his extreme intolerance led Christians to expect the worst things and made the outlook exceedingly gloomy. The Neronian persecution is probably referred to in 6 : 9 *seq.*, where "the souls of them that had been slain for the word of God" cry out for judgment and vengeance. In 17 : 11, "the beast that was, and is not, is himself also an eighth, and is of the seven," is probably Domitian.[2] There was a widespread impression among pagans and Christians alike that Nero, whose cruelty was so appalling as to seem more than human, would return to renew his desolating work. It is not necessary to suppose that the author of the Apocalypse believed in the literal reappearance of Nero; but

---

[1] Eusebius, following Hegesippus.

[2] Domitian was the eighth emperor (omitting Galba, Otho, and Vitellius). Nero was the fifth and so was "of the seven."

his obscure language would seem to reflect the popular sentiment. Rome was no doubt meant by "Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of the harlots and of the abominations of the earth" (17 : 5). "The beast that thou sawest was, and is not; and is about to come up out of the abyss" (ver. 8) is doubtless Nero and Domitian. The book is addressed to the seven churches of Asia, and there are separate epistles to Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea, in which the spiritual condition of each church is described. A general state of tribulation and harassment, by reason of persecutors and false teachers, may be inferred from these addresses. The apocalyptic form of literature had been fully developed in the pre-Christian time and the author was no doubt acquainted with some of the earlier apocalyptic writings.

7. *The Gospel and Epistles of John.* That the Apostle John spent the later years of his life at Ephesus and that he lived to the time of Trajan (98) is related by Irenæus (*c.* 175). Clement of Alexandria (end of second century) relates that he went forth to the "neighboring territories of the Gentiles, to appoint bishops in some places, in other places to set in order whole churches, elsewhere to choose to the ministry some of those that were pointed out by the Spirit."

The composition of the Gospel and the Epistles is commonly ascribed to the last years of the apostle's life. Irenæus represents John as having written the Gospel as a polemic against Cerinthus, a noted contemporary heretic. According to Clement of Alexandria John wrote a spiritual Gospel to supplement the other Gospels, in which the external facts had been sufficiently narrated. That the Gospel, especially in the prologue, should betray the writer's acquaintance with the Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy, cannot with propriety be urged against its Johannean authorship. If, as is commonly admitted, the apostle continued in vigorous activity to the time of Trajan, there is no reason why he should not have become possessed of all the philosophical culture manifest in the Gospel. That he should have emphasized the spiritual aspects of Christ's teachings is what might have been expected of the disciple "whom Jesus loved." It is not practicable to discuss here the Johannean question, which still constitutes one of the live issues of New Testament criticism.

The Epistles are commonly accepted as the works of the author of the Gospel. The First Epistle is particularly interesting as indicating to us the forms of error prevalent in Asia Minor during the last years of the apostolic age. The first verse is highly significant. The author's object is evidently to set aside the view that the Word became incarnate in appearance only (Docetism) by giving personal testimony as regards his own proving of the reality of the Word of life manifested to men by hearing, sight, and touch. In 4 : 2 stress is laid on the reality of Christ's humanity: "Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God." Again (2 : 18, 20, 23) we have indications of Ebionitic denial of the deity of Christ. Antichrists are said to be already in the world, who had gone out from the Christians because they were not of them. He is called a liar "that denieth that Jesus is the Christ. This is the antichrist, he that denieth the Father and the Son." Stress is laid on the unction of the Spirit as enabling believers infallibly to discern the truth, and love, in truly Johannean phrase, is made the "new commandment," which he writes to his "little children." He calls his own time "the last hour" and regards the hatred of the world as what was to be expected.

8. *The Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians.* This letter addressed by the Roman church to the Corinthian church, said to have been written while Clement was pastor of the Roman church and commonly attributed to him, was probably contemporaneous with the Johannean literature and so falls nominally within the apostolic age; but as it is commonly classed with the "Apostolic Fathers," which belong as a body to the next period, it seems best to defer our discussion of its authorship, date, character, and contents.

It may be here remarked that while in the person of John direct apostolic influence persisted in the province of Asia until about the close of the first century, in most communities it ceased two or three decades earlier. The death of Paul and of Peter, about 64, deprived extensive regions of the apostolic guidance on which they had especially relied. The generation following to the death of John was an age of transition, and ecclesiastical development was as free from apostolic guidance in many regions as in the second and following centuries. This was no doubt true of the churches of Rome and Corinth.

It will be interesting to note here the condition of these churches as set forth in the epistle addressed by the former church to the latter in response to an urgent request for advice. The reply has been delayed by "sudden and successive calamitous events" (no doubt the persecution under Domitian). The Corinthian church had fallen into discord, which the writer declares to be worse than that in Paul's time. The main trouble seems to have been that ambitious men of the younger generation had gained such ascendency in the church as to be able to supplant the elders that had been appointed by the apostles, or, as the writer says, "the worthless rose up against the honored, those of no reputation against such as were renowned, the foolish against the wise, the young against those advanced in years" (chap. 3). The opinion is expressed that those appointed by the apostles "or afterward by other eminent men, with the consent of the whole church, and who have served the flock of Christ, in a humble, peaceable, and disinterested spirit, and have for a long time possessed the good opinion of all, cannot be justly dismissed from the ministry" (chap. 44). Throughout the epistle the office of oversight is represented as committed to elders and not to a single chief official. There is no mention made of any individual headship either in Rome or in Corinth. X

wrote to
a Clement X
the church in Rome

CHAPTER III

CONSTITUTION OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCHES

LITERATURE: In addition to the pertinent works referred to in the preceding chapter, Hatch, "The Organization of the Early Christian Churches," 1882 (also German translation with important annotations by Harnack); Cunningham, "The Growth of the Church in its Organization and Institutions," 1886; Hort, "The Christian Ecclesia," 1897; Lightfoot, "Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians" (excursus on "The Christian Ministry"); Harnack, "*Dogmengeschichte*," *Bd.* I. (also English translation); Lechler, "History of the Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times"; Allen, "Christian Institutions," 1898; Baur, "The Church of the First Three Centuries"; Jacob, "Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament"; Dargan, "Ecclesiology," 1897; Ritschl, "*D. Altkathol. Kirche*," 1857; and articles on the church and its various officers and institutions in Cremer, "Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek," and in the Bible dictionaries and encyclopedias.

I. THE CHURCH AND THE CHURCHES.

1\. *Uses of the Term ἐκκλησία in the New Testament.* The word denotes literally "a calling out," or the result of a calling out of the people for public purposes, that is, an assembly. In this sense it is used in profane Greek, in the Septuagint, and in a few instances in the New Testament (Acts 19 : 32, 39, 40, 41). When applied to Christians the word means in the New Testament: (1) The entire community of the redeemed, considered as an organism held together by belief in a common Lord and by participation in a common life and salvation, and in common aims and interests. In the Septuagint the word is used to designate the "congregation of the people of Israel, whether summoned or met for a definite purpose, or the community of Israel collectively regarded as a congregation."[1] The word in the New Testament, as in the Old, carries with it the idea of holiness. It was in this sense that our Lord used the word in Matt. 16 : 18, and it is so used in Acts 9 : 31 (critical text), 1 Tim. 3 : 15, and in many other passages. (2) The word was so specialized as to be applied to definite bodies of believers assembling in particular places for the worship of God, for mutual edification, for the exercise of discipline, and for the carrying forward of Christian work. In this sense it occurs by far the most frequently. In Matt. 18 : 17, *seq.*, our Lord seems to contemplate a Christian local assembly capable of hearing the complaints of the injured brother and of proceeding against the offender. Examples of this usage are Acts 16 : 5 ; 1 Cor. 16 : 19 ; Philem. 2 ; Phil. 4 : 15. Whenever the plural occurs, or the church in a particular place is mentioned, this use of the word may be inferred. The following observations may here be made :

---

[1] Cremer.

(1) If any distinction is to be made between the use of the term "church" in the general sense and that of the terms "kingdom of God" and "kingdom of heaven," it is that the latter, used almost exclusively by our Saviour, designates rather the sphere of divine dominion in human life, "the realization of the divine purpose of salvation,"[1] the divine order and mode of life that is as fully present in each individual as in the entire body of the redeemed; while the former, used more commonly in the apostolic writings, indicates the entire body of believers, conceived of as fundamentally holy but as still throughout the present life subject to human frailties. Each believer has the kingdom of God within him and himself exemplifies in a measure the principles of the kingdom, is indeed, so far as he is Christlike, a constituent part of the kingdom ; but all the regenerate, as such, however far short of perfection they may fall, constitute the church. The local church is made up theoretically of the truly regenerate only ; as a matter of practice no amount of precaution has ever succeeded in preventing the incoming of deceivers or deceived.

(2) By some[2] the word is thought to contain an allusion to the calling of believers, by God's grace, out of the darkness of sin and condemnation into the light and liberty of the gospel covenant. That this thought early entered into the use of the term scarcely admits of doubt. The constant use of the related terms "calling," "the called," etc., could hardly have failed to suggest this thought.

(3) When the term is used in the general sense, there is no implication of any organic outward connection of the individual parts. We speak, *e. g.*, of the press, or the bar, without implying any organic connection between the various individuals embraced by these terms. Oneness of life and of purpose, involving fellowship and mutual helpfulness as occasion may arise, is all that can be inferred from this use of the term.

2. *The Local Churches and Contemporary Organizations.* (1) The close relationship of the local churches of the

---

[1] Cremer. [2] Jacob, "Ecc. Pol.," p. 8 ; Hodge, "Ch. Pol.," p. 8, *seq.*, *et. al.*

apostolic age to the Jewish synagogues is manifest to every reader of the New Testament. It is probable that among Jewish Christians the term synagogue was very commonly employed to designate their assemblies. An example of this usage is found in James 2 : 2. The apostles habitually made the Jewish synagogues the point of departure for their evangelistic efforts, and it would seem that they transferred their labors from the synagogues to other meeting-places only when determined opposition among the members made continuance therein impracticable. If the membership of any synagogue had been united in accepting Jesus as Lord, there is no reason to doubt but that it would thereby have been transformed into a Christian church with such modifications only as the newly received life might require. There is no intimation in the New Testament of the introduction of presbyters as church officers. As a feature of synagogal organization the eldership was too familiar an institution to be considered worthy of remark. When a group of believers, cast out of the synagogue, met together for worship and for the carrying forward of Christian work, it was perfectly natural that the older and more experienced brethren should by common consent be entrusted with the leadership and that these leaders should be denominated presbyters or elders. Judaism recognized the right of all parties of Jews to have their separate synagogal meetings. Alexandrian Jews had their synagogue in Jerusalem. In great cities Jews of different nationalities had their separate synagogues. In Jerusalem especially, Christians long continued to regard themselves as Jews, nay, as the only true Jews, and that they should meet separately from other Jewish parties in synagogues of their own was to be expected.

Each synagogue appears to have been normally self-governing and independent. The Sabbath meetings were presided over by the "ruler of the synagogue." In close connection with each synagogue was a court of elders (Sanhedrin, συνέδριον), probably elected by the membership of the synagogue from the older and more experienced men, which had its regular meetings in the house of worship and which constituted a court for the trial of all local breaches of the law. The Sanhedrin consisted of at least three elders, of whom one was the president. The plurality of elders in the early Christian churches, a thing perfectly natural in itself, thus had its prototype in the synagogue. As the early missionaries to the Gentiles, apostles and others, were for the most part Jews or Jewish proselytes, the influence of the synagogue on the organization of Gentile churches must have been considerable.

(2) If any additional explanation of the organization of Christian life in Gentile communities be thought needful, it is furnished by the prevalence of the organizing disposition in the Græco-Roman world at that time. Guilds, clubs, and societies for every imaginable purpose existed everywhere. "There were trade guilds and dramatic guilds; there were athletic clubs and burial clubs and dining clubs; there were friendly societies and financial societies; if we omit those special products of our own time, natural science and social science, there was scarcely an object for which men combine now for which they did not combine then"[1] Nearly all such organizations had their religious features; but distinctively religious organizations were also common. Vast numbers conformed outwardly to the State religion, while in private associations they followed the dictates of their own consciences. Apart, therefore, from Jewish influence, it was the most natural thing in the world for those who by accepting Christianity had made a breach with their former religious and social customs to unite in societies for mutual edification and support and for the carrying forward of Christian work. Such secret associations were looked upon with distrust by the Roman government because of the danger of their becoming hotbeds of treason. Hence the persecution to which Christians were everywhere subjected. The general prevalence of deep poverty among the classes from which Christianity chiefly drew and the abounding charity that characterized early Christianity and helped to make it attractive to the depressed classes had much to do with some of the features of the church order of the early centuries.

---

[1] Hatch, "The Organization of the Early Christian Churches," p. 26., *seq.* Hatch gives copious references to epigraphical and other literature and cites many interesting cases.

While community of goods was not generally practised in the apostolic churches, the generous support of the poor everywhere prevailed. The collection and the distribution of charitable funds was one of the most important departments of Christian activity. The term "bishop" and terms of similar meaning—overseer (ἐπίσκοπος), curator (ἐπιμελητής)—were in very common use in contemporary pagan organizations. That those who had the oversight of the Christian societies and to whom the management of the common charities was entrusted should be designated by the same terms is what might have been expected. The process by which the presiding presbyter or bishop came to be a monarchical prelate will be shown in the next period.

3. *The New Testament Churches were, in the Intention of Jesus and of his Apostles, made up exclusively of Baptized Believers.* If unworthy persons found entrance into Christian churches, whether as self-deceived or as deceivers, they were not really of the churches and the duty of withdrawing fellowship from such is inculcated in the apostolic writings. There is no sufficient reason for believing that the patriarchal idea, in accordance with which the whole family, including infants, became as a matter of course participants in all the religious privileges of the paternal head, found place in primitive Christianity. There is no intimation in the New Testament that baptism was intended to take the place of circumcision and thus to be applicable to infants. The religion of the New Testament is individualistic and personal in the fullest sense of the terms. Christ insisted that the tenderest relationships should be unhesitatingly sundered for the sake of the gospel, and that fathers, mothers, children, wives, and possessions should be hated in comparison with fidelity to him.

[illegible]

4. *The Universal Priesthood of Believers is clearly a New Testament Doctrine.* This doctrine absolutely excludes the idea of a special sacerdotal class in the church or in the churches. It implies equality of rights and privileges for the entire believing membership, but not identity of function. "To each one," says the Apostle Paul, "is given the manifestation of the Spirit to profit withal" (1 Cor. 12 : 7). "There are diversities of gifts, but the

same Spirit" (ver. 4). The apostle represents the church as a body made up of many members, some strong and comely, others weak and uncomely, some whose functions are from the human point of view honorable, others whose functions are without honorable associations; yet all alike necessary, each to the whole organism and each to the other. According to this view of equality of right and diversity of gifts, the apostle makes the following specifications: "And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments (or wise counsels), kinds of tongues." The "church" may mean, in this passage, either the entire Christian fellowship or the local body of believers in Corinth. As the writer's aim was to inculcate brotherly unity and co-operation in the church addressed, the local application cannot be excluded. Spiritually gifted brethren, set apart in an orderly manner because of their gifts for the service of the body, were regarded as servants and not masters. The edification of the body was the matter of supreme moment. No one had a right to refuse service to which he was called by the vote of his brethren acting under the guidance of the Spirit, and no one had a right to oppose himself to a brother performing special functions so long as he appeared to be guided by the Spirit.[1]

5. *The Apostolic Churches were Independent, yet Interdependent.* Churches exercised over each other such moral influence as their character for spiritual and practical wisdom warranted, and it was free to any church to give or withhold fellowship with other churches or their members according as they approved themselves worthy of fellowship or the reverse. The church at Jerusalem, as the mother-church and as the church-home for a number of years of most of the original apostles, naturally exerted for a time an influence beyond that of other churches. This is manifest in the anxiety of Paul to secure its approval of his work among the Gentiles. But it is probable that he was almost as much concerned to free his Jerusalem brethren from a narrowness that

---

[1] Harnack speaks of the "Independence and equality of each individual Christian" ("*Dogmengeschichte,*" *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 155).

he regarded as contrary to the spirit of the gospel and to secure their moral support in the great work of world-evangelization which he believed had been laid upon him, as to gain their endorsement for his mission. There is no reason to think that after the death of James the Just the Jerusalem church enjoyed any special consideration. Apart from this instance there is no semblance of a difference of rank among the apostolic churches.

Harnack speaks of "the independence and sovereignty of the local churches" (*Gemeinden*), as, in the opinion of Christians of the later apostolic and the early post-apostolic times, "resting upon the fact that they (the churches) had the Spirit in their midst." If apostolic authority was recognized, it was because the apostles were regarded as divinely inspired.[1] Hatch remarks: "The theory upon which the public worship of the primitive churches proceeded was that each community was complete in itself."[2] He explains how (from the third century onward) "the Christian churches passed from their original state of independence into a great confederation." Referring to Christian representative assemblies during the third century and the letters sometimes addressed by them to other churches, he remarks: "But so far from such letters having any binding force on other churches, not even the resolutions of the conference were binding on a dissentient minority of its members."[3]

Cunningham remarks: "The first form of the church was congregational, for every member took a part in its management and every congregation was independent of every other and was a complete church in itself."[4] #

II. OFFICERS OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCHES.

In [illegible]

In the earliest apostolic times the organization of the churches seems to have been very slight, and the terms applied to the various functionaries were not used with technical exactness. Apart from the appointment of the "seven men of good report, full of the Spirit and of wisdom" (Acts 6) to look after the distribution of the charities, the only officials that we meet for some time are the elders. It is probable that at first these were not formally appointed to this position; but that those who by reason of age and experience were naturally looked up to as leaders received this designation after the example of the synagogues. Spiritual gifts, such as are described in 1 Corinthians 12, were no doubt freely exercised without regard to formal invitation by the churches or to official position.

---

[1] "*Dogmengeschichte*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 157.

[2] "Organization of the Early Christian Churches," p. 79.

[3] *Ibid.*, 171.

[4] "The Growth of the Church," p. 23.

1. *Apostles.* This term (equivalent to *missionary*) is used in the New Testament in a narrower and a broader sense. In the broader sense it included such missionaries as Barnabas, Apollos, Timothy, Silvanus, Andronicus, Junias, etc., and continued to be applied to a class of itinerant evangelists until long after the apostolic age. The presupposition in each case was that the person so designated had been called and qualified by God for his mission. In the narrower sense it is used of the Twelve, who were specially chosen by Jesus and trained by him. The place of Judas Iscariot was filled by the appointment of Matthias, of whose career little is known. Paul claimed equality with the Twelve because of his miraculous conversion and the special manifestation to him of the risen Christ. The apostles were missionaries at large and seem not to have held official positions in any local church. Even while the Twelve tarried in Jerusalem their relation to the church does not seem to have been official. "They served the church universal, devoting themselves to the conversion of the world and thus to the extension of the kingdom."[1] Their relations to churches formed under their ministry were paternal. They could advise and recommend, and even remonstrate, but their authority was purely moral and their right to obedience rested on the fact that their utterances were divinely inspired. The special divine inspiration of the apostles fitted them to be the vehicle of divine revelation. Through them the churches have received in authoritative form the revelations of the New Covenant.

2. *Prophets.* To what extent prophets constituted a distinct class in the apostolic churches is not clear. Prophecy is recognized as a gift of the Spirit, and prophets are placed next to apostles in 1 Corinthians 12. A prophet is one who speaks forth under divine impulse what has been divinely revealed to him. Prophecy in the New Testament time commonly assumed the form of inspired exposition of Old Testament Scripture. In Acts 13 : 1 Barnabas and Saul are mentioned, along with others,

---

[1] McGiffert p. 650, *seq.*

as "prophets and teachers" at Antioch. According to Acts 11 : 27, "there came down prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch. And there stood up one of them named Agabus and signified by the Spirit that there should be a great famine." Judas and Silas, of the Jerusalem church, are spoken of as prophets (Acts 15 : 32). Paul magnified the gift of prophecy and desired that all the Corinthian Christians might prophesy (1 Cor. 14). It is probable that all of the apostles and all of the leading evangelists of the apostolic age possessed this gift; but doubtless there were many whose chief endowment was prophecy and who were known as prophets. Their authority, like that of the apostles, was based upon the fact that they were supposed to speak under divine prompting. As pretended prophets were not wanting, it became necessary to try the spirits. Paul exhorts the Thessalonians not to despise prophesyings, but to "prove all things." The "discerning of spirits" is specified by Paul (1 Cor. 12 : 10) among the gifts of the Spirit.

3. *Teachers.* Teaching is also regarded by Paul as a gift of the Spirit. Apostles and prophets and most of the prominent Christian workers were doubtless teachers; but it would seem that there were some in whom the gift of teaching was especially prominent and who received this designation. This divinely imparted gift fitted them to instruct and edify the churches and entitled them to a respectful hearing.

4. *Evangelists.* In Eph. 4 : 11 evangelists are mentioned, after apostles and prophets, as Christ-given workers in the Christian cause. The term is of course applicable to all divinely called proclaimers of the gospel. These four classes of Christian workers were not church officers in the restricted sense of the term. Those that follow are church officers proper.

5. *Presbyters or Bishops.* The unofficial presbyters of the earliest apostolic age were followed after a few years by presbyters appointed by their brethren under the advice often of apostolic men, and solemnly set apart by the latter. Their functions were the administration of discipline, the settlement of disputes among Christians, the conducting of the public services, the administration of the ordinances, the supervision of the charities, and gen-

eral oversight of the church community. Public teaching and prophecy were not necessary functions of the presbyterate; but such gifts were not disregarded. It is probable that in most communities the appointed presbyters were also teachers or prophets. It was not uncommon that among the presbyters of a church some one was so eminent for gifts and for elevation of character as to acquire the practical leadership of the body. The permanent chairman of the Board of presbyters became the president or bishop of the second century, and his position was analogous to that of a modern congregational pastor. In Eph. 4 : 11, 12 "pastors" are mentioned among those given by Christ "for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ."

In Gentile churches the appointed and ordained elders were commonly designated "bishops" or "overseers." The identity of appointed elders and bishops in the apostolic age is now commonly admitted by Roman Catholic and Anglican writers, and is insisted upon by scholars in general. Both terms, when applied to church officers in the New Testament usually occur in the plural. Some interpreters suppose that the "angel" of each of the seven churches of Rev. 2 and 3 was the chief pastor or head-presbyter. If so we have a New Testament parallel to the bishop of the second century.

For full proof that in the New Testament a two-fold ministry (bishops or presbyters, and deacons) and not a three-fold ministry (bishops, presbyters, and deacons) is recognized, see Lightfoot, "Commentary on Philippians," p. 93, *seq.*, and the works of Hatch, Cunningham, McGiffert, Harnack, Weizsäcker, Jacob, Conybeare and Howson, and Schaff, referred to in the "Literature." See also article by the writer in Jenkens' "Baptist Doctrines."

6. *Deacons.* It has commonly been assumed that "the seven" appointed to "serve tables" (Acts 6) were deacons. The term means "minister" or "servant," and the corresponding verb and abstract noun, are used with reference to any kind of ministry. All Christians are or should be deacons in this broad sense. The seven were appointed for a particular kind of ministry, namely, the distribution of the charities of the church. But there is no evidence that this arrangement was long

continued in the Jerusalem church or that it was adopted by other churches in the earliest apostolic times. Many modern writers see in the seven the germ of the Board of appointed elders or bishops of the later time. It is remarkable that, according to Acts 11 : 30, the relief sent "unto the brethren that dwelt in Judæa . . . by the hand of Barnabas and Saul" was delivered "to the elders," who no doubt distributed it to the needy. The presence for some years of the apostles in Jerusalem may have limited the functions of the elders there so that they corresponded closely to those of the deacons of churches otherwise conditioned, while the apostles performed the work of spiritual guidance and instruction elsewhere and later committed to the appointed elders or bishops. The mention of deacons in the New Testament in the official sense is strikingly infrequent. In Phil. 1 : 1 they are saluted along with the bishops of the church, and in 1 Tim. 3 : 8, *seq.*, their qualifications are given after those of bishops. Equal elevation of character is required for the two offices, but aptness to teach is not specified in the case of deacons. The "women" mentioned in ver. 11, just after the qualifications of deacons have been enumerated, may have been the wives of deacons, but it is more probable that deaconesses are meant, the word being naturally supplied from the context. Phœbe is designated in Rom. 16 : 1 as a deaconess of the church of Cenchreæ. The term may be here employed in its non-official sense.

In the completely organized churches of the later apostolic age there was a Board of deacons side by side with a Board of appointed elders or bishops, the former assisting the latter in the gathering and the distribution of the charities, in the exercise of discipline, and to some extent in the more spiritual work.

On the diaconate see Uhlhorn's excellent discussion in his "Christian Charity in the Ancient Church," p. 74, *seq.*, and the pertinent passages in the works of Hatch, Cunningham, Weizsäcker, Ritschl, Harnack, and McGiffert, referred to in the "Literature."

III. ORDINANCES OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCHES.

The religion of Christ is essentially free from mere ceremonialism. The two ordinances established by

Christ himself are of deep spiritual significance, but having their ceremonial side were peculiarly liable to perversion and were early degraded almost to a level with heathen rites.

1. *Baptism.* Christian baptism is the immersion of a believer in water as a symbol of death to sin and resurrection to newness of life. Jesus himself required baptism at the hands of John the Baptist, meeting his remonstrance with the remark that "thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," and it was on this occasion that his Divine Sonship was proclaimed from heaven and that the Spirit rested upon him.

The meaning of the word, the description of the act in individual cases, and the symbolism (burial and resurrection) all seem to fix the outward form of the ordinance as immersion.

Our Lord's own direction regarding baptism makes it follow faith, and the very nature of the ordinance renders it applicable exclusively to those capable of repentance and faith.

Referring to the practice of the churches about the middle of the second century, Harnack remarks: "Descending and ascending in baptism and immersion were regarded as highly important, but not as indispensable symbols." This last statement he bases on the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," which he supposes to have been written as early as 160. Regarding infant baptism at the same date, he remarks: "A sure trace of infant baptism is not found in this epoch; personal faith is a necessary condition." Again: "Origen [third century] held it easy to justify infant baptism, since he recognized something sinful in bodily birth itself, and since he knew of sins that were committed in an earlier life. The oldest attempt to justify infant baptism, accordingly, goes back to a philosophical doctrine."[1]

Hauck, referring to New Testament baptism, remarks: "Baptism probably always took place through immersion in flowing water." As regards the subjects of baptism he has the following: "That in the New Testament is found no direct trace of infant baptism must be regarded as firmly established; attempts to prove its necessity from the manner of its institution, its practice from such passages as Acts 2 : 39; 1 Cor. 1 : 16, suffer from the defect that the thing to be proved is presupposed."[2] In relation to the introduction of infant baptism Loofs remarks: "Infant baptism first provable in Irenæus, still combated by Tertullian, was to Origen an apostolic usage."[3]

---

[1] "*Dogmengeschichte,*" *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 150, 358.

[2] Art. "*Taufe,*" in the "*Real-Encyklopädie,*" second ed., *Bd.* XV., *Seit.* 219, 220.

[3] "*Dogmengeschichte,*" *Seit.* 137.

Such citations from the foremost German and Anglican authorities might be multiplied. A remark by Zenos, a learned American Presbyterian, is so out of harmony with the results of German and English scholarship as regards the form of apostolic baptism that it may be quoted as a curiosity: "Not only adults, but households were its subjects. As it was a mere symbol of cleansing, sometimes sprinkling, sometimes affusion of water, and sometimes, perhaps, immersion in water were employed, each mode being regarded as sufficient and valid."[1] He gives no authorities for this almost unique view.

2. *The Lord's Supper and the Agapai* (ἀγάπαι). The Lord's Supper as an ordinance was based upon the paschal supper which Jesus ate with his disciples just before his crucifixion. Luke alone of the evangelists records our Lord's injunction, "This do in remembrance of me." John's account of the paschal supper is occupied almost wholly with Judas' treachery, and makes no mention of the distribution of the bread and the wine to the disciples as his body and his blood. John is unique in recording the washing of the disciples' feet. The institution of the Supper was in connection with the paschal meal; but the giving of thanks and the distribution of the bread and the wine with appropriate remarks were distinct from and followed the paschal meal proper. This feature is wholly omitted in John's narrative. It is difficult to decide whether anything like a ceremonial observance of the Supper is referred to in Acts 2 : 46: "And day by day, continuing stedfastly with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart." If so, it was simply the ordinary meals of the Christians sanctified and spiritualized by their intense religious fervor. The "breaking of bread," in Acts 20 : 7, 11, following a prolonged discourse of Paul at a gathering of believers, was almost certainly a memorial feast; but it is probable that it was a "love-feast" as well. There is no conclusive evidence that during the apostolic age the Supper and the "love-feast" (*agapai*—ἀγάπαι)

---

[1] "Comp. of Church History," p. 28.

existed as separate institutions. The term "love-feasts" occurs in the New Testament, possibly designating a Christian collation, only in 2 Peter 2 : 13 : "Revelling in their love-feasts while they feast with you," where many ancient authorities (preferred by Westcott and Hort) read "in their deceivings" (*apatais*—ἀπάταις), and in Jude 12, a closely related passage, where of certain vile heretics it is said : "These are they who are hidden rocks (or spots) in your love-feasts, when they feast with you." Many ancient authorities here also read "in their deceivings." These passages furnish at best a very slender basis for any theory regarding the manner of celebrating the Supper at this time.

The fullest and most instructive account of the ordinance in the apostolic age is that of Paul in 1 Cor. 10 and 11. In 10 : 16–22, the apostle, warning the Corinthian Christians against idolatrous practices, writes : "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of (or participation in) the blood of Christ ? The bread (loaf) which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ ? seeing that we, who are many, are one bread (loaf), one body." Those who rightly partake of the Christian feast cannot, without the gravest inconsistency, partake of things sacrificed to idols. "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of demons : ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and the table of demons." Again (chap. 11), referring to divisions in the church that make it impossible for them when they assemble "to eat the Lord's Supper," Paul administers a severe rebuke to their selfish and unchristian behavior as follows : "For in your eating each one taketh before other his own supper ; and one is hungry, and another is drunken." What the apostle condemns is not the fraternal meal in which a sufficiency of food is provided for all, and in which rich and poor participate freely on a footing of equality, thus remembering their common Saviour and manifesting Christian love for each other ; but the selfish gratification of appetite on the part of some in disregard of others, to the destruction of brotherly love. Such a meal could not properly be called "the Lord's Supper" ; for the spirit of it was diametrically opposed to the spirit of the gospel. Those who manifested such greed and such lack of brotherly love could not possibly discern the Lord's body in the feast, and the pretence of eating the "Lord's Supper" involved the unworthy participants in the divine judgment that rests upon hypocrisy and sacrilege.

Paul connects the Supper thus grossly perverted by the Corinthian Christians, with our Lord's Supper with his disciples "in the night in which he was betrayed." He gives substantially the same account of Jesus' words on this occasion as we find in Luke's Gospel. More even than Luke he emphasizes the Lord's injunction, "This do in remembrance of me," specifying the memorial character of the Supper in connection with the distribution of both the bread and the wine, and adding the words, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come."

It is not a little remarkable the New Testament contains so few notices of the celebration of this ordinance. Outside of the doubtful passages referred to in Acts 2 and in 2 Peter and Jude, the notices are confined to Paul's Epistles and to the portions of the Acts that relate to his work. And even in these portions of Scripture they are few, and except in 1 Corinthians, without detail. But the universal celebration of the ordinance in the early post-apostolic time makes it certain that the apostolic churches generally remembered the Lord in this way.

The following remarks are suggested by the facts that have been considered:

(1) The Lord's Supper was in its intention and in the practice of the apostolic churches a means of manifesting brotherly love, and of commemorating the Lord's atoning work on the part of baptized believers, that is, of those who had been received into the Christian fellowship through profession of saving faith in Christ followed by baptism.

(2) It seems certain that the bread and the wine were not partaken of in minute quantities as at present. The abuses that grew out of the more abundant partaking of food and drink, condemned so vigorously by Paul, and the vast growth in the membership of churches rendering it inconvenient for them to come together frequently

for the fraternal meal, led to the celebration of the Supper in a more ceremonial manner with the use of small quantities of bread and wine and the separate and perhaps less general use of the social meal (ἀγάπαι).

Feet-washing has by some been regarded as a Christian ordinance, on the basis of our Lord's example, who at the last paschal supper washed his disciples' feet, and of his words (John 13 : 14, 15): "If I then, the Lord and the Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done unto you." The only other New Testament reference to the washing of feet is that in 1 Tim. 5 : 10, where the fact of having "washed the saints' feet" is given among the qualifications of widows as officially recognized beneficiaries and workers in the churches. There is no indication in the New Testament, or in the Christian literature of the first three centuries, that our Lord was understood to have instituted an ordinance by the acts and words under consideration. Feet-washing was a common and needed act of hospitality in Palestine at the time, and the teaching that Christ intended to convey was the manifestation of the spirit of brotherly love in acts of humble service.

The earliest reference to the ceremonial use of feet-washing is in the canon of the synod of Elvira (306) where it is condemned. Augustine (end of the fourth century), who mentions it among the observances of Maundy Thursday (the day of the Last Supper), states that lest it should appear to be in any way essential to the sacrament (Supper) many churches had never admitted the custom at all.[1] Ambrose mentions it at about the same time as in use at Milan. The synod of Toledo (694) excluded from communion such as should refuse on Maundy Thursday to participate in this ceremony.[2] Bernard (twelfth century) wrote of feet-washing as "a sacrament of the remission of daily sins." The practice prevailed to some extent in the Greek Church. In modern times the pope, the emperors of Austria and Russia, the kings of Spain, Portugal, and Bavaria, and bishops and abbots of the Roman Catholic Church, have each twelve poor men brought in on Maundy Thursday, and wash their feet. Many Anabaptists (including Mennonites), some Baptist parties, the Moravian Brethren, and the Sandemanians, have practised ceremonial feet-washing.

It is probable that our Lord did not intend to enjoin its ceremonial observance, but that at the last Supper he simply aimed to emphasize the duty of humble service. The great mass of evangelical Christians have thus understood the matter and have regarded with disfavor the literal imitation of Jesus' act.

IV. WORSHIP—ELEMENTS, TIMES, AND PLACES.

1. *Elements of Worship.* The worship of the early Christians was very free and informal. It consisted of

---

[1] "*Epp.,*" CXVIII. and CXIX.

[2] Binterim, "*Denkwürdigkeiten,*" *Bd.* V., *Seit.* 204.

prayer, the singing of psalms, and the reading and exposition of the Old Testament Scriptures (prophesying). The participation in worship was not confined to the official members, but to every male member it was permitted to utter his apprehension of truth. The ordinary services of the early churches were very similar to those of a good prayer meeting at the present time.

2. *Times of Worship.* The Jewish Christians continued for a long time to observe the Jewish Sabbath, assembling also on the Lord's Day. The Jewish Sabbath seems never to have been enjoined upon the Gentile churches; and we find early in the second century the first day of the week observed as a matter of course.

(1) The process of the change was probably as follows: At first the Jewish Sabbath *and* the Lord's Day were celebrated by most Christian communities. Two circumstances led to the abandonment of the former. First: The inconvenience of celebrating two days in immediate proximity. Secondly: The spirit of opposition to the extreme Judaizers. Christians saw that a large and influential party was trying to make Christianity a mere Jewish sect. They were disposed, therefore, to reject as much as possible of the Jewish ceremonial.

(2) With regard to the propriety of the change, two views have obtained currency among those who defend it: First: That the Sabbath is of perpetual obligation but that the essential idea is that of rest and worship on one day in seven. As the resurrection of the Son of God is to Christians of fundamental importance, it was fitting that the one day in seven should be made to coincide with the day of this great event. Second: Christianity in its ideal form is entirely without ceremonial and holy days. All days alike are holy, and are to be spent in the service of God. But as actual Christianity is not ideally perfect, and as Christians are obliged to engage in secular callings, etc., it is necessary that there should be some fixed time for special religious services. Christianity had a right to adopt any day for this purpose. As a matter of fact it very appropriately adopted the day on which the Saviour rose from the dead.

3. *Places of Worship.* The Jerusalem Christians met for a time partly in the temple and partly in an upper

room. The apostles, in their missionary work, went first to the Jewish synagogues. When driven from the synagogues they commonly held their meetings in private houses. It is probable that during the later apostolic age the Christians of Rome made considerable use of the catacombs (underground burial places) for religious purposes. Domitilla, banished under Domitian, is said to have given land for Christian catacombs. Not until the first half of the third century did the Christians build houses of worship.

V. METHODS OF CHRISTIAN PROPAGANDISM.

The primitive Christians were essentially missionary. Each believer regarded it as incumbent on himself personally to propagate the faith that had saved him. Christians worked:

1. Privately, among friends and relations, by whom, however, they were often cast off as a result of their becoming Christians.

2. In the Oriental cities and villages the custom of talking at the corners of the streets prevailed to a great extent. An earnest Christian would thus frequently find opportunity to draw together a knot of hearers and to tell them of Christ.

3. Artisans of various sorts often found opportunity to spread the gospel among their fellow-workmen.

4. After the time of the Apostle Paul, most of the spread of the gospel was effected, not by direct missionary efforts, but by the moving hither and thither throughout the empire of artisans and tradesmen, who planted Christianity wherever they went. So also Christianity was frequently spread by persecution, each fugitive forming a new center of Christian influence.

5. The burning enthusiasm of the early Christians was contagious. The minds of many were troubled. They could no longer believe in the decaying paganism which the philosophers had taught men to despise. Christianity, as represented by its enthusiastic devotees, met the felt needs of men. Its doctrine of the equality of all men before God, and of the worth of all human souls, its promises of future happiness, such as would make present sufferings of small consideration, tending

to elevate them and to deliver them from despair. The abounding charity of the early Christians, at a time when poverty and distress abounded, drew to their fellowship multitudes of the depressed classes.

6. The Christians were obliged to labor for the most part secretly. They could not hold public services to which the unconverted could be invited. Their assemblies for worship were almost exclusively of church-members. Only after one had been led to accept Christ did he gain access to the conventicles of the Christians. But the degree of secrecy necessary varied greatly at different times and at different places. While the Christians were on amicable terms with the Jews, whose religion was tolerated, they had more freedom. When they became objects of hatred to the Jews their freedom was less.

PERIOD II

FROM THE END OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE TO THE CONVERSION OF CONSTANTINE (100–312)

CHAPTER I

RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO THE ROMAN EMPIRE FROM THE TIME OF THE APOSTLES TILL THE ADOPTION OF CHRISTIANITY AS THE RELIGION OF THE EMPIRE

LITERATURE: Pliny, Epistles, Bk. X., Chap. 96, 97; Marcus Aurelius, "Meditations," Bk. XI., Chap. 3; Eusebius, "*Hist. Ecc.*," Bk. VI., VII., VIII., IX., etc.; Routh, "*Reliquiæ Sacræ*," Vol. I., p. 295, *seq.*; Lactantius, "*De Mort. Persec.*"; Justin Martyr, "*Apol.*," I., 68; Tertullian, "*Apol.*"; Cyprian, "*De Lapsis*" and "*Epp.*"; Pontius, *Cyprianus*; "Martyrologies," in Migne's "*Patrol. Lat.*," Vol. XI., p. 434, *seq.*; Neander, Vol. I., p. 86, *seq.*; Schaff, Vol. II., p. 31, *seq.*; Ramsay, "The Church in the Roman Empire"; Hardy, "*C. Plinii Secundi Epistolæ*," especially the Introduction; Pfleiderer, "*Das Urchristenthum*"; Bruno Bauer, "*Christus u. d. Cæsaren*,"; Arnold, "*Studien zur Gesch. d. plinianishen Christenverfolgung*"; Neumann, "*Der röm. Staat u. d. allgemeine Kirche bis auf Diokletian*"; Mommsen, "History of Rome: the Provinces"; Allard, "*Hist. des Persecutions*"; Addis, "Christianity and the Roman Empire"; Uhlhorn, "Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism"; Mœller, "History of the Christian Church," Vol. I., p. 74, *seq.*, 87, *seq.*, 159, *seq.*, 190, *seq.*; Aubé, "*Hist. des Pers. de l'Eglise*"; Renan, "*Marc-Aurèle*"; Keim, "*Rom u. d. Christenthum*"; Mason, "The Persecution of Diocletian"; Merivale, "History of Rome Under the Emperors"; Overbeck, "*Studien zur Gesch. d. alt. Kirche*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 93, *seq.*; Pressensé, "Martyrs and Apologists," p. 67, *seq.*; Gibbon, Chap. XVI.; Gieseler, "Church History," Vol. I., p. 119, *seq.*; Niebuhr, "History of Rome," Vol. III., *passim*; Mossman, "Early Christian Church," p. 144, *seq.*; Alzog, "Universal Church History," Vol. I., p. 169, *seq.*; Wieseler, "*Die Christenverfolgungen der Cæsaren*"; Lightfoot, "Ignatius," Vol. I., pp. 1–69; Hardy, "Christianity and the Roman Government," 1894; Schiller, "*Gesch. d. röm. Kaiserzeit*," 1883–87; Seek, "*Gesch. d. Untergangs d. antiken Welt*," Vol. I., 1895; Gregg, "The Decian Persecution" (Hulsean Prize Essay for 1896); Overbeck, "*Studien zur Gesch. d. alt. Kirche*"; works on the Catacombs, by De Rossi, Northcote and Brownlow, Parker, etc. Articles on the various emperors in Smith and Wace, "Dictionary of Christian Biography," and in the general and religious encyclopedias. The articles in the new edition of the Herzog-Hauck "*Real-Encyklopädie*" are particularly valuable.

I. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

1. THE apostles had labored and died in spreading the gospel. Throughout Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, and pos-

sibly even farther west, the gospel had been preached and Christian churches established. Christianity had now to make its way without apostolic aid, in the face of obstacles that to human apprehension must have seemed well-nigh insuperable.

2. We shall see that Christians were everywhere persecuted, but that persecution, for the most part, tended to spread rather than suppress the truth.

3. We shall see that Christianity entered upon its career almost void of literary and philosophical culture and social standing, and that at the close of this period it had drawn to itself the culture of the age and had gained the homage of kings.

4. We shall see that this accession of culture had its disadvantages as well as its advantages; for along with culture came philosophical error and imitations of pagan ceremonial observances.

5. We shall see that as soon as Christianity came to be forwarded by any other than legitimate means, as soon as increase of power and respectability was set up as an object of endeavor, a door was thrown open for the entrance of all sorts of abuses.

6. In general, we may characterize the present period as the period of the gradual growth and the gradual corruption of Christianity until it became strong enough on the one hand to make its adoption by the empire a matter of policy, and corrupt enough on the other to rejoice in such adoption.

II. CAUSES OF PERSECUTION.

Christianity was a *religio illicita.* had no protection It was the policy of the Roman Empire to tolerate the religions of conquered peoples, so long as they would not attempt to proselyte. Judaism was a *religio licita*. Christianity, so far as it was distinguished from Judaism, was reckoned among secret societies or collegia which were contrary to law. Cicero[1] says: "Separately let no one have gods, nor may they worship privately new or foreign gods unless they have been publicly recognized." Gaius,[2] speaking of forbidden associations, says: "Neither a society

---

[1] "De Legibus," Bk. II., Chap. 8.

[2] Bk. III., Chap. 4, ¶ 1.

3. Canabalism,

nor college, nor body of this kind, is conceded to all promiscuously; for this thing is coerced (regulated) by laws or codes of the Senate and imperial (or princely) constitutions." The essentially proselyting spirit of Christianity was an additional cause of its unlawfulness.

2. Christianity was a religion which aspired to universality. Christ's kingdom was to be set up throughout the whole earth. With the Romans the State was the chief thing. Religion was to be promoted only in so far as it served the interests of the State. The Christians had no sympathy with this idea, and their enemies lost no opportunity to represent Christianity as dangerous to the State. This brought upon them the enmity of rulers.

3. Christianity was a religion hated by the influential classes. The withdrawal of Christians from social intercourse with the pagans, rendered necessary by the idolatrous practices connected with every department of life, caused the Christians to be looked upon as enemies of the human race. Their refusal to participate in idolatrous rites and to frequent the temples, and the exclusion from their homes and, of necessity, their persons of all symbols of idolatry, led them to be looked upon as atheists—enemies of the gods. As enemies of mankind and of the gods, they were regarded with the profoundest abhorrence by the people in general. Nothing was too bad to be believed of such people. The Christians were known to assemble at night secretly; they were observed to be very fond of each other. What but the gratification of lust could be the motive of such assemblies? As they assembled in considerable numbers, the gratification of lust must be promiscuous. What could be more natural than to ascribe to this mysterious, ungodly people the additional crime of eating the bodies and drinking the blood of the offspring of their orgies? The standing charges against Christianity, therefore, for several generations were atheism, promiscuous licentiousness, and cannibalism. See the "Apologies" of Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tertullian, and Origen, in which these accusations are stated and refuted. Most of the persecution which the Christians suffered was the result of this popular hatred.

4. The fact that Christianity was recruited chiefly from the poor and the outcast caused Christianity to be looked down upon by the respectable and by those who would be regarded as respectable.

5. Christians shared with Jews the contempt which the Romans always had for this people—only they were regarded as far worse and were without the protection which the Jews enjoyed even after the destruction of Jerusalem. After the Jewish rebellion of A. D. 135 their advantages over Christians probably ceased or were greatly diminished.

6. Christianity, by its enthusiasm, shocked the sensibilities of many of the purest and best philosophers. These might have been expected to favor Christianity; but they regarded it rather as a wild fanaticism which could only do harm to its adherents.

7. Christianity came into conflict with the temporal interests of certain classes, as priests, venders of sacrificial animals, makers and venders of idols. Many persecutions were aroused by such persons, as in the New Testament times, so later.

8. The occurrence of famines, earthquakes, military reverses, conflagrations, etc., frequently furnished occasion for the persecution of the Christians, who, as enemies of the gods, were supposed to be the cause of the evils.

III. TREATMENT OF CHRISTIANS BY DIFFERENT EMPERORS.

Many of the emperors during the second and third centuries were men of great moderation, and might have been expected to abolish persecution. But we shall see that in some instances the most violent persecutions occurred under the wisest and most upright rulers. This is to be accounted for in part by the fact that such men were more likely than others to adhere rigidly to the laws against unauthorized religions; were more anxious than others to maintain the splendor of the old religion; were more repelled by the, to them, fanatical proceedings of the Christians; were more under the influence of philosophers, who showed great enmity toward Christianity and wrote against it (*e. g.* Marcus Aurelius was greatly influenced by Stoic and Cynic philosophers).

1. *From Trajan to Marcus Aurelius* (98–161). (1) *Trajan* (98–117), one of the best of Roman emperors, is the first with regard to whom we know certainly that he formally proscribed secret societies, among which Christian churches were included. He had no true conception of Christianity, agreeing with his friends Tacitus and Pliny in regarding it as a "bad and immoderate superstition." Our most trustworthy knowledge of his attitude toward Christianity is derived from the letter of Pliny, the younger, governor of Bithynia, asking for information with regard to the right method of dealing with Christians, and the rescript of Trajan (*c.* A. D. 112). Pliny states that he has never had anything to do with the trial of Christians and therefore is ignorant what and how great punishment ought to be inflicted; whether there ought to be any discrimination in respect of age; whether favor should be shown to the penitent; whether they should be punished for the shameful reputation attached to the name, if nothing shameful be proved in individual cases. His method of procedure, meanwhile, is declared to be: to question those who are brought before him as to whether they are Christians, threatening punishment if they persist, and sending to prison those that refuse to curse Christ and offer sacrifice to the gods and to the image of the emperor; others, who were Roman citizens, he had noted down to be sent to Rome; those who denied being Christians he had liberated. He thinks it important that some definite method of procedure should be agreed upon, because so great a number are involved. Those who confess to having been Christians, but now reject Christianity, inform him that the sum of their error was that they were accustomed to assemble before light; to sing a hymn to Christ; to promise that they would commit no crime—theft, robbery, adultery, embezzlement of entrusted funds; and later in the day to partake of a meal in common. In order to arrive at the truth more assuredly, Pliny had tortured two female slaves, who were called *ministræ* (possibly deaconesses), but had learned nothing beyond the fact that Christianity was a bad and immoderate superstition. By his proceedings he had brought it about that the temples, before almost deso-

lated, had begun to be frequented; sacrifices, long since suspended, had been resumed; the feeding of victims had been taken up, etc. He refers to an imperial mandate forbidding secret societies (*hetæriæ*) which he is attempting to enforce. He intimates that the Christians, in consideration of his prohibition of secret societies, had given up their social gatherings, and there is no intimation that their punishment was for violation of this law.[1] Trajan replies that Pliny has acted properly in the cases mentioned; and that no universal rule can be laid down. Christians are not to be sought out for persecution, but when legally arraigned are to suffer for their violation of the laws.

The precise attitude of Trajan toward Christianity is still a matter of controversy. Christian writers of the succeeding time took a highly favorable view of his tolerance. Melito of Sardis (*c.* 170) seems to have regarded him as a protector of Christians.[2] Lactantius ignores his persecutions, while Eusebius seeks to free Trajan himself from responsibility for such persecutions as occurred during his reign, and gives him credit for mitigating the violence of persecution. Mediæval legend represented him as having been released from infernal torments through the intercession of Pope Gregory I. Most modern critics have gone as far in the opposite direction, maintaining that Trajan's rescript introduces a new era in the relation of the empire to Christianity distinctly more unfavorable to the latter. This view is taken by Gieseler, Overbeck, Aubé, Uhlhorn, Keim, Renan, *et al.* Lightfoot, who thinks it probable that Nero issued a distinct prohibition of Christianity, maintains that Trajan introduced no new policy, but simply gave his sanction to the carrying out of a policy that had prevailed from the time of Nero. Hardy is inclined to regard Trajan's rescript "as favorable, and as rather discouraging persecution than legalizing it."[3] It is probable that up to this time "there was no express law or formal edict against the Christians in particular. . . They had before this been classed generally as outlaws (*hostes publici*) and enemies to the fundamental principles of society and government, of law and order, and the admission of the name Christian in itself entailed condemnation. . . While Trajan felt bound to carry out the established principle, his personal view was opposed to it, at least to such an extent that he ordered Pliny to shut his eyes to the Christian offense, until his attention was expressly directed to an individual case by a formal accuser."[4] The fact seems to be that Trajan was not a wanton persecutor, and that he meant to discourage malicious informers, but that as emperor he felt the necessity of upholding the laws and maintaining the State religion. So far as our information goes, the only persecutions with which Trajan had anything to do were the Bithynian, under Pliny, that at Jerusalem, in which Symeon suffered, and that at Antioch, in which Ignatius was the chief victim.

---

[1] Pliny, Bk. X., Ep. 96, 97.

[2] Eusebius, "*Hist. Ecc.*," Bk. IV., Chap. 26.

[3] "*C. Plinii Secundi Epp.*," p. 62, *seq.*

[4] Ramsay, "The Church in the Roman Empire," Chap. X., especially p. 223.

[illegible]

(2) *Hadrian* (117–138) had little faith in the popular religion and took considerable interest in foreign cults; but he regarded the maintenance of the religious establishment as a political necessity. He was strongly opposed to the violent outbursts of popular hatred against Christians, very common at this time. He declared that no accusations against Christians were to be received, except such as were in legal form. Justin Martyr appeals in his "First Apology," addressed to Antoninus Pius (*c.* 152), to a rescript of Hadrian, of which he gives the text. The rescript (addressed to Minucius Fundanus, proconsul of Asia about 124) forbids riotous proceedings and information where gain seems to be the motive. "If any one, therefore, accuses them and shows that they are doing anything contrary to the laws, do you pass judgment according to the heinousness of the crime. But, by Hercules! if any one bring an accusation through mere calumny, decide in regard to his criminality and see to it that you inflict punishment." The authenticity of this document has been called in question by Baur, Keim, Lipsius, Overbeck, Aubé, McGiffert, *et al.* Its genuineness is defended by Ramsay, Lightfoot, Mommsen, Funk, Uhlhorn, Ranke, Mœller, *et al.*, who, however, do not understand Hadrian as aiming to shield Christians so much as to discourage tumultuary procedures. The fact that it appears in an almost contemporaneous writing (Justin's "Apology") is highly favorable to its authenticity. That a forgery should have become current during the lifetime of its alleged author, and especially that a forged imperial edict should have been incorporated in an apology addressed to the succeeding emperor, is scarcely credible.

Mommsen remarks: "The groundless suspicions cast on the genuineness of this document are the best proof how little capable recent writers are of understanding the attitude in which the Roman government stood to the Christians."[1] Lightfoot: "Not only is this rescript no stumbling-block when confronted with the history of the times; some exact action on the part of the emperor is required to explain the history."[1] Ramsay exposes in a telling manner the absurdity of the objections raised by Keim and others to the genuineness of this document.

---

[1] Quoted by Ramsay, p. 322.

The Jewish insurrection against the empire, under Barcochab, occurred during this reign (135). Large numbers of Christians in Palestine were slain by the infuriated Jews. The suppression of the insurrection was followed by a loss of privileges on the part of the Jews. Hadrian now built on the site of Jerusalem Aelia Capitolina and erected a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus on the temple area. Jews were forbidden to enter the city or even to see from a distance the land of their fathers.[2] Whereas before the Jews had held a more favorable position than the Christians, the Christians were now regarded with far more favor than the Jews. This was an important gain for Christianity, and led, doubtless, to the overthrow of Judaistic tendencies in the Christian church. Yet Christianity was still a *religio illicita*. The pastor of the Roman church, Telesphorus, and many others, suffered martyrdom at this time.

It is not even stated that the name Christian is no longer criminal. The rescript left it open for provincial governors either to inflict severe penalties on the Christians or to discourage their arraignment to such an extent as to involve virtual toleration. The "Apology of Quadratus," unfortunately lost, was addressed to Hadrian. The progress of Christianity during this reign in numbers, learning, wealth, and social influence must have been very marked; yet persecution was not wanting.

(3) *Antoninus Pius* (138–161) was one of the wisest and most upright of emperors. His biographer, Capitolinus, claims that, so far as he is personally concerned, he enjoys the almost unique distinction of being free from civil and hostile bloodshed.[3] During his reign various public calamities occurred—famine, the inundation of the Tiber, earthquakes, conflagrations at Rome, Antioch, and Carthage. These aroused the people against the Christians, who were supposed, by forsaking the gods, to have brought on these calamities. The emperor attempted to shield the Chris-

---

[1] "Ignatius," Vol. I., p. 478, second ed. [2] Eusebius, Bk. VI. [3] Chap. XIII.

tions from popular rage, but not with complete success. In an edict (found in Eusebius, "*Hist. Ecc.*," Bk. IV., Chap. 13, the spuriousness of which is now generally admitted), Antoninus rebukes the pagans for their violence, telling them that if the Christians have offended the gods, the gods ought to be left to take vengeance for themselves and that they (pagans) confirm the Christians in their minds by accusing them of impiety. He contrasts the cheerfulness of Christians in calamities with the terror of the pagans. He commands that if any persist in raising tumults against the Christians they shall be punished.

Although this document in the form in which we have it is unquestionably a forgery, there is no sufficient reason to doubt but that Antoninus did issue an edict, with the design of protecting Christians against mob violence.

The early Christian tradition that he favored the Christians (Melito, *c.* A. D. 170, Tertullian, early in the third century) must have rested on a basis of fact. Melito, in his "Apology" addressed to Marcus Aurelius, says: "And thy father, when thou also wast ruling with him, wrote to the cities, forbidding them to take any new measures against us; among the rest to the Larissæans, to the Thessalonians, to the Athenians, and to all the Greeks."[1] Harnack regards the edict as essentially genuine, but supposes that it suffered repeated interpolations.[2]

It is remarkable that while Eusebius ascribes the document to Antoninus, the inscription, as quoted by himself, assigns it to Marcus Aurelius.

Christianity showed remarkable energy and underwent remarkable changes about this time. Gnosticism was at its height. The "Apology of Aristides," recently brought to light, was a product of this reign. Justin Martyr wrote many of his works, including his "Apology," under this emperor, and it was in the latter part of his reign that Polycarp of Smyrna died a martyr's death. Harnack attributes the rise of the monarchical episcopate to this time, and he finds here the beginning of the process of consolidation in opposition to Gnosticism that was to result in the formation of the Roman Catholic church.[3] Montanism had its rise at this time. Christian literature was greatly enriched. [illegible]

---

[1] Quoted by Eusebius, Bk. IV., Chap. 26.

[2] "*Chronologie*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 702, and "*Texte und Untersuchungen*," *Bd.* XIII., *Heft* 4.

[3] Art. "Antoninus Pius," in "*Real-Encyklopädie*," third ed.

2. *From Marcus Aurelius to Decius* (161–249). By the time of Marcus Aurelius Christianity had become an important element in society. Conscious of its strength, it had become bold and aggressive. Many cultivated men had come into the church and were devoting their powers to its defense. Most of the persecutions during this time had for their object the restoration of the declining paganism to its original splendor and power.

(1) *Marcus Aurelius* (161–180) was educated as a philosopher and was imbued with the ethical principles of eclectic Stoicism. He was simple and temperate in life and sought to rule justly. Yet Christians suffered under him more severely than under any emperor since Nero, whose cruelty he abhorred and whom he pronounced "not a man." The enthusiasm of Christians seemed to him mere fanaticism, and their steadfastness under persecution he looked upon not as fidelity to a high principle, but rather as obstinacy in disobedience to constituted authority. His teacher, Fronto, had given him an early and decided bias against Christianity, and the Cynic philosopher, Crescens, the bitter opponent of Justin Martyr, had confirmed him in his aversion. While he had little faith in the State religion, like Hadrian he regarded its maintenance as a political necessity; and he not only withheld from Christians the protection from popular violence that had been accorded to them by Trajan and his successors, but he encouraged and promoted persecution.

This reign, like the preceding, was remarkable for calamities. Earthquakes more terrible than those under Antoninus, destructive inundations followed by famine and pestilence, insurrections and invasions on the frontiers involving the empire in almost continuous and often disastrous war, aroused the fury of the populace against the Christians whose impiety and rapid increase was thought to have angered the gods. Christians, on the other hand, saw in these disasters the divine judgment on the iniquity of the government and of the people, and no doubt in some cases openly rejoiced in them as presages of the final judgment and the end of the age. Such an attitude would tend still further to irritate their pagan enemies.

The following particulars are worthy of attention:

a. There is no evidence that anything like a general persecution was undertaken at this time. The ferocious uprising against the Christians of Lyons and Vienne, in the south of Gaul, in which a large number of Christians were brought before the authorities charged with incestuous orgies, cannibalism, etc., subjected to the most horrible tortures to compel confession of these crimes, and at last thrown to the wild beasts or otherwise cruelly slain, seems to have been quite exceptional. The details of this persecution are given in a beautiful letter addressed by "the servants of God residing at Vienne and Lyons, in Gaul, to the brethren throughout Asia and Phrygia," preserved by Eusebius.[1] The "tribulation" is ascribed to "the fury of the heathen against the saints." The "adversary" is said to have "endeavored in every manner to practise and exercise his servants against the servants of God, not only shutting us out from houses and baths and markets, but forbidding any of us to be seen in any place whatever." A large proportion of those arrested persisted under repeated and most excruciating tortures in denying the charges of criminality and in confession of Christ. Many died in prison from the effects of the tortures and lack of proper food and nursing. Some were weak enough to deny their faith and to make the required confession; but not even so did they escape further sufferings. Some who yielded at first afterward received strength to confess Christ and to suffer martyrdom. These proceedings were conducted by the Roman governor with the full approval of the emperor.

b. The martyrdom of Justin, the philosopher, who was the most important literary defender of the faith that the age produced, is commonly ascribed to the machinations of Crescens, a disreputable philosopher. This occurred in Rome about 165. According to an early narrative six companions suffered with him.

c. An apparently authentic account of the execution of several Christians in Pergamus, Asia Minor, has been preserved.[2] A number of other martyrdoms are supposed to have occurred in Asia during this reign, as that of Thraseas, pastor of the church at Eumenea, and that of Sagaris, pastor at Laodicea.

---

[1] Bk. I.

[2] Harnack, "*Texte u. Untersuchungen,*" *Bd.* III., *Heft* 4.

d. The peculiarities of the persecution under this emperor are:

First, that the emperor *issued a decree against the Christians* which, in the opinion of Melito of Sardis, was "not fit to be executed even against barbarian enemies." This decree encouraged informers by allowing them to take the property of the accused and made it possible for the governors to enrich themselves by confiscations.

Secondly, the emperor *encouraged inquisitorial proceedings* for the discovery and arraignment of Christians.

Thirdly, *torture* was employed as a means of compelling Christians to renounce their faith and to commit acts of idolatry.

e. That Christianity was becoming more and more vigorous and aggressive is evident from the abundant apologetical and polemical literature of the time. Christianity was rapidly drawing to itself of the culture of the age and Christian philosophers were more than a match for their pagan and Gnostic antagonists.

f. During this reign Montanism, which may have arisen in the preceding reign, came into prominence. The Alogoi, as opponents of the Montanistic prophecy, now appeared. The controversy regarding the time of celebrating Easter dates from this reign. New Gnostic parties arose and older parties flourished.

g. The consolidation of the Catholic church, with its monarchical episcopate, its emphasizing of apostolic authority and apostolic succession, and its New Testament canon, in opposition to Gnostic and Montanistic heresy, made marked progress during this reign.

h. The persecution under Marcus Aurelius was not of so long duration nor so exterminating as not to be favorable, on the whole, to the spread of Christianity. It advertised Christianity, and that in a very favorable way. Christianity now had standing enough to draw toward it the sympathies of large numbers of people. The fortitude with which Christians endured persecution seems to have now revealed to many the power of this religion over the human heart, and a very rapid growth of Christianity throughout the empire followed. Christians soon swarmed in all the cities and were numerous in many rural districts. With rapid growth came in much worldliness and insincerity, immunity from persecution for a number of years making it easy for all who felt any interest in Christianity to enter the churches.

i. Now for the first time pagan scholars thought it worth their while to read the literature of the Christians and to attempt to overthrow Christianity by polemical writings. Foremost among efforts of this kind was the work of Celsus, the Platonist, whose "True Discourse" Origen was to answer at length about fifty years later. Celsus supposed that the persecuting measures of the emperor would result in the extermination of Christianity. In their sufferings was fulfilled the saying of Apollo's priest: "The mills of the gods grind slowly," etc. Referring to Christ he wrote:

> The demon is not only reviled, but banished from every land and sea, and those who, like images, are consecrated to him, are bound and led to punishment and impaled, whilst the demon—or as you call him, the Son of God—takes no vengeance on the evil-doer. The Jews, instead of being masters of the whole world, are left with not so much as a patch of ground or a hearth; and of you [Christians] one or two may be wandering in secret, but they are being sought out to be punished with death.

So little appreciation did this brilliant philosopher have of the vitality and all-conquering power of the gospel.

(2) *Commodus* (180–193) was dissolute, timid, suspicious, and at last cruel and vindictive; yet his attitude toward Christianity was more favorable than that of any of his predecessors. This was due, no doubt, in part at least, to the influence of his favorite concubine Marcia, who took the Christians under her protection, secured the deliverance of many from the Sardinian mines, where they were suffering fearful hardships, and sought in many ways to further their interests. Whether Marcia was herself a member of the Roman church is uncertain; but the corruptions of the church as described by Hippolytus at about this time were such as to make her membership a possibility. The patronage of such a personage no doubt contributed toward the lowering of the moral

standard of the churches under the influence of the Roman and rendered effective discipline exceedingly difficult.

Referring to this reign Eusebius says: "About this time . . . our condition became more favorable, and through the grace of God the churches throughout the entire world enjoyed peace, and the word of salvation was leading every soul from every race of mankind to the devout worship of the God of the universe. So that now at Rome many who were highly distinguished for wealth and family turned with all their household and relatives unto their salvation."[1] Yet he refers immediately afterward to the martyrdom of Apollonius, a man of renown among the faithful for learning and philosophy, who was condemned to death on the accusation of a slave by a decree of the Senate. Whether Apollonius was condemned simply on the ground of his Christian profession or on the ground of some specific charge of violation of the laws does not appear. To save herself from falling a victim to his almost insane cruelty Marcia joined with others in compassing the assassination of the emperor.

(3) *Septimius Severus* (193–211) was not intensely hostile toward Christianity. In fact, it has been commonly supposed that up to 202 he was somewhat favorably disposed. It is related by Spartianus that on his return from a victorious campaign against the Armenians and the Parthians (202), while sojourning in Palestine, he enacted a law forbidding conversions to Judaism or Christianity. It does not appear to have been his purpose to attempt the extermination of Christianity, but simply to put a check upon proselytizing. But the enforcement of the Trajanic law against Christianity as an unauthorized religion involved many Christians in severe suffering. It does not appear that the emperor issued an edict of persecution; but he no doubt encouraged the local officials diligently to enforce the old laws.

Clement of Alexandria, who was at the head of the catechetical school, wrote some time before the close of the second century: "Many martyrs are daily burned, crucified, and beheaded before our eyes." About 202 or 203 he was obliged to abandon his work and retire from the city. The father of Origen suffered martyrdom at this time. Origen himself, then a zealous and brilliant youth, was saved from a like fate by the tact of his mother, who hid his clothes and thus prevented him from publicly proclaiming himself a Christian and gaining the martyr's crown. About 200 a number of Christians, including three women, suffered joyfully at Scillite, in

---

[1] "Church History," Bk. XXI.

Scillitan marty

Numidia, falling on their knees and praising God. At Carthage two young women, Perpetua and Felicitas, won the highest admiration of their contemporaries and of posterity by resolutely refusing to yield to the entreaties of parents and friends or to the promptings of maternal affection, to save their lives by denying the faith, and by cheerfully confronting the maddened beasts. These last and their companions in suffering are supposed to have been Montanists. Tertullian refers to persecutions in Numidia and Mauritania about 211.

(4) *Caracalla* and *Heliogabalus* were among the most contemptible of rulers; but both tolerated Christianity. *Caracalla* (211–217) recalled all who were in banishment, but had his brother and co-heir Geta murdered with twenty thousand of his supposed supporters. His mother Julia Domna, a Syrian woman, with her sister Julia Moesa and the daughters of the latter, Soœmias, the mother of the Emperor Heliogabalus, and Julia Mammæa, the mother of the Emperor Alexander Severus, was devoted to Oriental mysticism. These women were indifferent or hostile to the State religion, and surrounding themselves with a coterie of philosophers and scholars, devoted much attention to the free handling of religious questions and exerted a marked influence on the religious policy of the empire. The extension of citizenship to provincials broke down the old aristocracy and greatly facilitated the progress of Christianity by destroying artificial social distinctions. Caracalla was assassinated by the Pretorian Prefect Macrinus, who assumed the imperial crown and ruled fourteen months (217-18). His career as a political reformer was cut short by the intrigues of Julia Moesa, who induced the army to repudiate Macrinus and to elevate to the throne her grandson Avitus, who was at that time priest of the Syrian sun-god at Emesa, and who is commonly known by the name of his favorite deity, *Heliogabalus*. It was the aim of Heliogabalus and his female relatives to merge Judaism, Samaritanism, Christianity, and the State religion into a single eclectic system, in which sun-worship should predominate. He reveled in the extravagances and the obscenities of his favorite cult. Under the patronage of the imperial court Philostratus produced his life of Apollonius of Tyana, whom he sought to represent as a heathen Christ. Heliogabalus brought to Rome

[illegible]

the celebrated Black Stone of Edessa as a means of making his religion more attractive to the masses. It was his intention to erect a great temple in Rome in which, side by side with sun-worship, Jewish and Christian worship should be encouraged. It was no credit to Christianity to be tolerated and favored by so despicable a ruler; but freed from persecution, it doubtless enjoyed a very rapid growth and absorbed far more of pagan life than it could properly assimilate. Disgusted with the shameful license and the effeminacy of Heliogobalus, the army put an end to his rule and placed on the throne an emperor worthy of the name (222).

(5) *Alexander Severus* (222–235), a cousin of Heliogabalus, was noble-minded and devout, but was lacking in energy and in statesmanship. Though not a Christian, he gave to Christianity a place in his eclectic system and had a bust of Christ among those of other religious heroes (Apollonius of Tyana, Orpheus, and Abraham) in his private chapel.[1] His mother, Julia Mammæa, was the ruling spirit in the government, and to her favorable attitude the Christians were no doubt deeply indebted. She is said to have sent for Origen, the great Christian theologian, that she might receive from him instruction in the principles of Christianity, and to have treated him with much respect. When a dispute arose between the Christians and some cooks as to the possession of a building, Alexander decided in favor of the Christians, remarking that it was better that God should be worshiped there in any way whatever than that the place should be given over to cooks.[2] In recommending a new mode of apportioning the offices of the State he is said to have referred to the Christian church organization as a model. According to Lampridius he contemplated erecting in Rome a temple to Christ.[3] He is said to have frequently given utterance to the Golden Rule in its negative form and to have had it inscribed on public buildings. During this reign Christian houses of worship seem to have been first erected. The catechetical school of Alexandria flourished and Christian education made progress in Rome. Yet Christianity was not

---

[1] Lampridius, Chap. 29. [2] Chap. 49. [3] Chap. 43.

declared a lawful religion by imperial decree. In fact it was during this reign that Ulpian, the famous jurist, collected for public use the imperial rescripts against the Christians. It is probable that the sentiment of the Senate and of the Roman aristocracy in general was strongly adverse to Christianity and that Alexander and Julia Mammæa did not deem it prudent to produce radical changes in legislation in defiance of this class.

(6) *Maximinus the Thracian* (235–238), a military leader who had incited the troops to slay Alexander, succeeded to the throne by the favor of the army. He was one of the coarsest and most brutal of barbarians and was utterly incapable of appreciating anything noble. His bitter hatred of Alexander led him to persecute the Christians, many of whom held positions in the imperial household. According to Eusebius,[1] he commanded "that only the rulers of the churches should be put to death as responsible for the gospel teaching." Several prominent leaders of the church of Cæsarea (Palestine), including Origen's wealthy patron Ambrosius, who was robbed of his property, suffered severely at this time. Origen, now laboring at Cæsarea, escaped by concealing himself and addressed to his suffering friends his beautiful work on "Martyrdom." Pontianus and Hippolytus, officials of the Roman church, were banished to Sardinia.

(7) *Philip the Arabian* (244–248), son of a Bedouin sheik, is represented by Christian writers of a later date as a Christian. Eusebius relates that on one occasion he was so desirous of sharing with the multitude in the prayers of the church that he put himself in the place of a humble penitent, as he was required to do by the presiding official. It may be that he was only superstitious and was anxious to enjoy the favor of the God of the Christians without having any true conception of Christianity.

Dionysius of Alexandria (*c.* 255) writes of emperors "who were openly said to have become Christians." He must have had in mind Alexander Severus and Philip. Origen is said to have written letters to Philip and to Severa, his wife. Origen at this time looked forward with great hopefulness to the triumph of Christianity. All other religions, he thought, would pass away, but Christianity would go prosperously forward.[1]

---

[1] "Church History," Bk. VI., Chap. 26.

3. *From Decius Trajan to Diocletian* (249–284). The first half of the third century was a time of great peril to civil order in the empire. The provinces were ruined by excessive taxation wastefully and corruptly gathered and by barbarian invasions in the east and the west. Rome had become inconceivably corrupt and had lost the power to rule. Provincials who had gained prestige as military leaders were one after the other raised to the throne by the army, but few of these soldier emperors showed any capacity for government. The State religion was rapidly decaying. Christianity had gained vast numbers of converts in all parts of the empire and was by far the most aggressive of the religious forces of the age. With correct instinct those who were zealous for the maintenance of Roman imperialism looked upon the growing strength of Christianity with disfavor and distrust. The ideals of the Christians and the ideals of Roman imperialists were mutually antagonistic. The Roman State religion had from of old been regarded as one of the chief bulwarks of the empire. Its life-blood was rapidly being drawn out by aggressive Christianity. The time was approaching when this religion must be either exterminated or adopted as the religion of the State.

(1) *Decius Trajan* (249–251), an Italian soldier, was raised to the throne by the Danubian army after the battle with the Goths at Verona, in which Philip lost his life. He seems to have had an earnest desire to restore the empire to its pristine order and vigor. The millennium of the city was being celebrated with great splendor when Decius returned from the Gothic war. Special occasion was doubtless afforded thereby for remarking the decay of the State religion. The fact that Christians had been especially favored by his predecessor probably led Decius to suspect them of disloyalty to himself. It may be assumed from what we know of this ruler that his exterminating measures against Chris-

---

[1] "*Contra Celsum,*" Bk. III.

tianity did not proceed from sheer wantonness, but were from his point of view a political necessity. Only by the extermination of Christianity and the rehabilitation of the State religion could the unity and the stability of the empire be secured. In 250 was issued the first imperial edict aiming at the universal suppression of Christianity. Christians everywhere were required to conform to the State religion by participating in its ceremonies, and officials were commanded, under heavy penalties, rigorously to enforce the requirement. In each official district all Christians were required within a definite time to appear before the magistrates and to offer sacrifices to the gods. The flight of Christians before the expiration of the time allowed was not hindered, but the property of fugitives was confiscated and death was the penalty of returning. Those who were not in a position to prove that they had fulfilled the requirement were brought before a commission composed of officials and citizens. First they were threatened with the direst punishments in case of obstinacy. Threats were followed by torture. This failing, imprisonment and repeated tortures, including hunger and thirst, were resorted to as a means of breaking down the wills of the victims. All the influence and the machinery of the imperial government were employed to prevent laxity on the part of officials. The magistrates were enjoined to use special severity toward bishops and other influential leaders.

Immunity from persecution had brought into the churches multitudes of people who had no proper idea of the obligations of the Christian life and many who cannot be regarded as possessing a saving knowledge of the truth. Lamentable worldliness characterized many of the clergy, who were spending their energies in secular pursuits rather than in the ministry of the word. The imperial edict struck terror to the hearts of all whose faith was weak. "Before the battle," writes Cyprian, "many were conquered, and without having met the enemy, were cut down; they did not even seek to gain the reputation of having sacrificed against their will. They indeed did not wait to be apprehended ere they ascended, or to be interrogated ere they denied. Many were conquered before the battle, prostrated before the attack. Nor did they even leave it to be said for them that they seemed to sacrifice to idols unwillingly. They ran to the market place of their own accord."[1] Many were so impatient to deny their faith that they could hardly wait their turn. Cyprian himself retired before the fury of the persecution and thereby greatly injured his reputation among the stricter sort. Many who would neither flee nor sacrifice suffered the most terrible tortures and died in prison or were at last cruelly executed. Some by bribing the officials procured certificates of having sacrificed without committing the overt act. Some allowed others to say that they had sacrificed or to procure certificates for them. Holders of these fraudulent certificates were called *libellatici* and were regarded as scarcely less culpable than the Lapsi ~~or those~~ who actually denied their faith. Decius was after a few months called away by a fresh Gothic invasion and was slain in 251, but not until he had spread desolation throughout the churches. There was a slight lull in the storm of persecution under Gallus, but a year of public disasters (plague, drought, famine, barbarian invasions) drew the attention of the populace afresh to the Christians, whose hostility to the gods was supposed to be responsible for the calamities. Many were sent to the mines, which involved the direst hardship and often death.

---

[1] "De Lapsis," Bk. III., Chap. 8.

(2) *Valerian* (253–260), who had been closely associated with Decius, is said by Dionysius of Rome[1] to have "been mild and friendly toward the men of God" and to have treated them more kindly and favorably than any of his predecessors. "Not even those [emperors] that were said openly to be Christians received them with such manifest hospitality as he did at the beginning of his reign. For his entire house was filled with pious persons and was a church of God." But public calamities continued and when recourse had been had to every known expedient, including human sacrifices, he was persuaded, it is said, by one of his generals (Macrianus), an adept in Egyptian magic, to renew the persecution of Christians. At first he sought to suppress Christianity without bloodshed. In 257 he issued an edict commanding all Christians to conform to the State religion on pain of banishment. He directed that pastors be separated from their churches, and prohibited Christian assemblies of every kind. These measures proving futile, he issued in 258 an edict more sanguinary by far than that of Decius. Cyprian, bishop of the Carthaginian church, who had again gone into banishment by reason of the earlier edict and was soon after to fall a victim to the severer measure, gives the substance of the latter as follows:

---

[1] Quoted by Eusebius, "Church History," Bk. VII., Chap 9.

[illegible] Pastors   edict of 258

[illegible]

That bishops and presbyters and deacons should immediately be punished (*i. e.*, put to death); but that senators and men of importance, and Roman knights, should lose their dignity and moreover be deprived of their property; and if, when their means were taken away, they should still persist in being Christians, then they should also lose their heads; but that matrons should be deprived of their property and sent into banishment. Moreover, people of Cæsar's household, whoever of them had either confessed before or should now confess, should have their property confiscated and should be sent in chains by assignment to Cæsar's estates.[1]

The list of martyrs is too long for insertion. Besides Cyprian, many prominent bishops won the martyr's crown. Bishop Sixtus of Rome was seized in the Catacombs, where he was administering the Lord's Supper. After his trial and condemnation he was taken back and executed on the same spot.

The following remarks may be made on this series of persecutions:

a. The aim of the emperors was the utter destruction of Christianity, and the means most relied upon was the execution of the Christian leaders and the demolition of the Christian houses of worship.

b. The faith of Christians everywhere was put to a severe test and multitudes were found wanting.

c. This time of persecution gave rise to many controversies regarding the treatment of the lapsed, the authority of confessors, the prerogatives of bishops, etc., and a widespread schism (the Novatian) resulted.

d. The ability of Christianity, even in a somewhat corrupted form, to withstand the most determined assaults of the greatest world-power known to antiquity, was fully demonstrated and gave to Christians the fullest assurance of ultimate triumph.

(3) *Gallienus* (260–268), the successor of Valerian, favored the Christians, recalled the exiles, restored their church property, and forbade further molestation of them. From this time till the time of Diocletian the Christians suffered almost no persecution. They grew in numbers, wealth, church organization, and in worldliness. Pagans flowed into the churches, taking with them many of their pagan habits of life and thought, so that by the time of Diocletian the church was corrupt and worldly as never before, and was in no condition to meet a relentless persecution.[2] Christians had again

---

[1] Ep. LXXXI.

[2] Eusebius, "Church History," Bk. VIII., Chap. 1.

become so bold and aggressive as to arouse the jealousy of the pagans.

4. *Diocletian and Constantine* (284–323). *Diocletian* (284–316) was a Dalmatian soldier, perhaps originally a slave, who had made his way to the imperial throne by military prowess. The Christians had fully recovered from the persecutions of Decius and Valerian and were no doubt far more numerous and influential than ever before. Diocletian's wife, Prisca, and his daughter, Valeria, are said to have been Christians.[1] The imperial chamberlain Dorotheus and his associate, Gorgonios, were cruelly executed as Christians. That Diocletian was unfriendly to Christianity almost from the beginning is evident from a decree against the Manichæans issued from Egypt about 287. This document declares it to be wrong to oppose or resist the gods or to change from an old religion to a new, and in the highest degree criminal to abandon established usages that have come down from antiquity. This decree involves a condemnation of Christianity. It is not probable, however, that Diocletian would have entered upon so difficult an undertaking as the extermination of so widespread and aggressive a religion, had it not been for the fanatical zeal of his son-in-law Galerius, who, along with others, had been associated with him in the imperial office. Galerius resolved on the expulsion of Christians from the army. About 295 all the soldiers were ordered to sacrifice. Those that refused were expelled, and those that manifested zeal for Christianity were executed. Fire broke out in the imperial palace at Nicomedia on two different occasions (303). It was a convenient thing to charge the persecuted Christians with arson.

According to Eusebius,[2] "royal edicts were published everywhere, commanding that the churches be leveled to the ground and the Scriptures destroyed by fire, and ordering that those who held places of honor be degraded, and that the household servants, if they persisted in the profession of Christianity, be deprived of freedom." This first edict, issued in February, 303, was followed, according to Eusebius, by other decrees, "commanding that all the rulers of the churches in every place be first thrown into prison, and afterward by every artifice be compelled to sacrifice." It is noticeable that the great importance of the Scriptures is recognized and that the destruction of all copies is attempted. As in the Decian persecution, the severe measures were directed against the leaders of the churches, loss of civil and social standing being the only penalties now inflicted on laymen.

---

[1] Eusebius, "Church History," Bk. VIII., Chap. 1., and Lactantius, "Conc. the Death of Persecutors," XV.

[2] "Church History," Bk. VIII., Chap. 2.

On the day preceding the publication of the edict, the great church building of Nicomedia was burned to the ground. Immediately after the posting of the edict in Nicomedia, a Christian, "highly honored with distinguished temporal dignities, seized the edict as it was posted openly and publicly, and tore it to pieces as a profane and impious thing."[1] This rash act of defiance was summarily punished and no doubt greatly increased the fury of the persecution. In all parts of the empire the edict was executed with greater or less severity. Multitudes, as in the Decian persecution, hastened to deny the faith and to surrender their copies of the Scriptures; many bore the most horrible tortures and refused with their latest breath to surrender the Scriptures or in any way to compromise themselves. Some employed fraudulent methods of evading the requirements of the law.

Those who surrendered the Scriptures were stigmatized by their more courageous brethren as *Traditors*, and traditorism became the occasion of the great Donatist schism.

At this time there were four emperors: Diocletian in the East, Maximian at Rome, Constantius in Britain, Gaul, and Spain, and Galerius in Illyria. The two former were *Augusti* or emperors in the highest sense, the two latter were *Cæsars*. Constantius (who ruled in Britain and Gaul) was favorably disposed toward Christianity, and protected Christians as far as practicable. Diocletian and Maximian resigned the imperial dignity in 305. Galerius and Constantius succeeded them as *Augusti*, while Maximinus and Severus became *Cæsars*. In 306, after the death of his father, Constantius, Constantine was proclaimed *Augustus* by his army, Maxentius by the Prætorian Guards, and Severus by Galerius, while Maximian resumed the imperial dignity. In 307 Licinius was made *Augustus* by Galerius, and Maximinus by his army. Galerius had not yet recognized Constantine and Maximinus as *Augusti*. Severus was sent against Maxentius in 307. He was deserted and slain by his army. This left six claimants of imperial dignity. Maximian died in 310, Galerius in 311. This reduced the emperors to four.

---

[1] Eusebius, "Church History," Bk. VIII., Chap. 5.

Confessors – under suffering – [illegible] confessors [illegible]
and [illegible] martyrdom.

Constantine shared his father's favorable disposition toward Christianity. Galerius was stricken with disease and may have been thereby induced to relent. In 311, together with Constantine and Licinius, he issued an edict granting a limited toleration to Christians.[1]

Persecution was renewed in the East with terrible severity by Maximinus. Forged "Acts of Pilate" full of blasphemies against Christ were sent forth, with the emperor's approval, throughout his whole domain, with commands that they be publicly posted in every place and that schoolmasters teach them to their scholars. Some vile women of Damascus were induced to declare that they had been Christians and to accuse the Christians of the most impious and licentious conduct. Everything possible seems to have been done to arouse the fury of the people against Christians. The way having been thus prepared, he issued an edict to be engraved on brazen pillars in the cities, declaring Christianity to be an "execrable vanity," attributing to the toleration of Christians all the calamities that had come upon the land, and commanding that Christians be driven far from each community. This edict was issued in response to numerous petitions for the extermination of Christianity, which Maximinus himself was thought to have inspired. After the victory of Constantine he was constrained to grant complete toleration to Christians, with the restoration of confiscated property.

---

[1] While they prefer that all should conform to the "religion of their ancestors," recognition is made of the fact that some Christians have been driven by persecution to abandon the proper worship of their own God, and yet do not "offer to the heavenly gods the worship which is due." The result is that the empire suffers loss from their failure to worship any god aright. Permission is given Christians to "rebuild the conventicles in which they were accustomed to assemble," and the opinion is expressed that in consideration of this indulgence "they ought to supplicate their God for our (the emperors') safety, and that of the people, and their own, that the public welfare may be preserved in every place, and that they may live securely in their several homes" (Eusebius, "Church History," Bk. VIII., Chap. 17).

After the battle of the Milvian Bridge, between Constantine and Maxentius, in which Constantine, being now sole emperor in the West, attributed his victory to the succor of the God of the Christians, Constantine granted full toleration to the Christians, making it lawful for any one that wished to embrace Christianity (313). In this he secured the co-operation of Licinius, who soon afterward defeated Maximinus and became sole emperor in the East. This edict is known as the "Edict of Milan," and is one of the most important documents of the age. The more significant clauses are as follows:

> Perceiving long ago that religious liberty ought not to be denied, but that it ought to be granted to the judgment and desire of each individual to perform his religious duties according to his own choice, we had given orders that every man, Christians as well as others, should preserve the faith of his own sect and religion. [There follows an explanation of the change of policy, and the new policy is then described.] We resolved . . . to grant both to the Christians and to all men freedom to follow the religion which they choose, that whatever heavenly divinity exists may be propitious to us and to all that live under our government. We have, therefore, determined, with sound and upright purpose, that liberty is to be denied to no one to choose and follow the religious observances of the Christians, but that to each one freedom is to be given to devote his mind to that religion which he may think adapted to himself, in order that the Deity may exhibit to us in all things his accustomed care and favor. . . And we decree still further in regard to the Christians, that their places, in which they were formerly accustomed to assemble . . . shall be restored to the said Christians, without demanding money or any other equivalent, with no delay or hesitation. . . For by this means . . . the divine favor toward us which we have already experienced in many matters will continue sure through all time.[1]

In regard to this edict it may be said: (*a*) That it is the earliest known proclamation by a civil government of absolute religious liberty.

(*b*) It involves no repudiation of paganism, but seems to proceed on the supposition that by dealing generously with the worshipers of all gods and thus promoting their religious devotion, the favor of all gods for the emperors and their subjects will be secured. It is evident however that the emperors recognize the God of the Christians as of extraordinary importance.

---

[1] See Eusebius, "Church History," Bk. X., Chap. 5.

(*c*) The utilitarian spirit of the edict is everywhere manifest.

In 319 Licinius, always at heart an enemy of Christianity and doubtless suspecting that the Christians were favoring Constantine's ambitious aspirations after universal sovereignty, reversed his policy of toleration and subjected the Christians to the most cruel treatment.[1] Constantine conquered Licinius in 323 and became sole emperor. Thus Christianity triumphed in the Roman Empire after a struggle of two hundred and fifty years.

---

[1] See Eusebius, "Church History," Bk. X., Chap. 8.

Local Per.
Nero
Domitian
Trajan

[illegible]itian
[illegible]ntius

toleration edict.
Milan

universal persecutions — years
Septimius Severus 193-211
Decius Trajan — 249-284
Valerian — 253-260
Diocletian

[illegible] to sacrament.

CHAPTER II

INTERNAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY DURING THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES

I. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

1. IN a world filled with systems of philosophy and religion, and in a time of intellectual activity, such as was the beginning of the Christian era, it could not be expected that Christianity would long be able to hold aloof from other systems, neither imparting its own elements to them, nor absorbing foreign elements. Christianity drew its converts from two grand sources, Judaism and paganism. It would have been strange, indeed, if Jewish and pagan types of Christianity, mutually antagonistic, had not arisen, and if each had not made a distinct impression on the more catholic type that resulted from the conflicts of the second and third centuries.

2. Even among the New Testament writers different shades of opinion, different ways of conceiving divine truth, depending on the attitude of each writer toward Judaism and toward heathen culture, found place. Here, however, the diversity is comparatively superficial and easily harmonizes with what is central in Christianity. But uninspired men of the same tendencies and feelings might have been expected to go to extremes, either in making Judaism the chief thing and Christianity a mere appendage, or in rejecting Judaism absolutely and substituting heathen philosophical conceptions therefor.

3. Such an antagonism, having once entered the realm of Christian thought, naturally awakened intellectual activity, and led finally to the accurate definition of Christian doctrine according to the categories of the Greek philosophy.

Replying to Celsus' charge that Christians "were divided and split up into factions, each individual desiring to have his own party," Origen wrote: "Seeing Christianity appeared an object of veneration to men, and not to the laboring and serving classes alone, but also to many among the Greeks who were devoted to literary pursuits, there necessarily originated sects, not at all, however, as a result of faction and strife, but through the earnest desire of many literary men to enter more profoundly into the truths of Christianity. The consequence was, that understanding differently those discourses which were believed by all to be divine, there arose sects, which received their names from men who admired Christianity in its fundamental nature, but from a variety of causes reached discordant views."

II. HERETICAL SECTS OF THE PERIOD.

1. *The Ebionites or Judaizing Christians.*

LITERATURE: Irenæus, Bk. I., Chap. 26; Hippolytus, Bk. IX., Chap. 13–17; Epiphanius, Chap. 29, 30, 53; Clementine ("Homilies," "Recognitions," and "Acts of Peter"); Eusebius, "Church History," Bk. III., Chap. 27, and McGiffert's valuable notes; Schaff, Vol. II., p. 420, *seq.*; Möller, Vol. I., p. 97, *seq.*; Hilgenfeld, "*Ketzergeschichte*," p. 421, *seq.*; Ritschl, "*Die Secte d. Elkesaiten* (*Zeitschr. f. Hist. Theol.*," 1853); Neander, Vol. I., p. 341, *seq.*; Pressensé, "Her. and Christian Doctrine," p. 74, *seq.*; Mossman, "History of the Early Christian Church," p. 188, *seq.*; Bunsen, "Hippolytus and His Age," Vol. I., p. 127, *seq.*; Ritschl, "*Altkath. Kirche*," p. 104, *seq.*; Lechler, "*Das Apost. und das nachapostol. Zeitalter*," p. 449, *seq.* (also English translation); Baur, "*Die Chr. Gnosis*," p. 300, *seq.*; Mansel, "The Gnostic Heresies," p. 110, *seq.*; Standmann, "*Das Hebräer-Evangelium*" (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, V., 3); Lightfoot, "Epistle to the Galatians," p. 306, *seq.*; Matter, "*Hist. Crit. du Gnosticisme*," *Tom.* II., p. 228, *seq.*; Langen, "*Die Klemensromane*"; Harnack, "*Dogmengeschichte*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 215, *seq.* (also English translation); Lipsius, "*Die Quellen d. Römischen Petrussage*"; Uhlhorn, "*Die Homilien u. Recognitionen d. Clemens Romanus*"; Schliemann, "*Die Clementinen*"; Herzog-Hauck, "*Real-Encyklopädie*," art. "*Ebioniten*"; Schaff-Herzog, "Dictionary of Christian Biography," and "Encyclopædia Britannica," art. "Ebionites."

(1) *Origin of the Sect.* From the book of Acts and the Pauline Epistles, we see that there existed in the early church an extreme Judaizing party. Paul could come to an understanding with James and Peter, but an uncompromising set of Judaizers made it their business to follow in his footsteps to stigmatize him as a spurious apostle, to condemn his gospel as insufficient, and to insist on a rigid adherence to the Jewish law as necessary to salvation through Christ. Gradually the great body of Christians, being recruited from paganism, became emancipated from Jewish scruples and those who were inclined to make

much of Judaism were cast off as heretics. The destruction of Jerusalem (A. D. 70) greatly promoted the separation of Judaizers from Christians of the New Testament type. From about 110 until the suppression of the Jewish revolt under Barcochab (132–135) Judaism enjoyed a great revival over the Roman Empire and Judaistic Christians naturally were confirmed in their Judaism. After the suppression of the revolt the hopes of Judaism were crushed. The Judaistic elements soon separated themselves from Christianity, but the extreme Judaizing Christians persisted in small numbers in Palestine and the surrounding countries for about two hundred years longer. The separation was promoted by the increasing stress that was laid by the non-Judaizing Christians on the essential and absolute Deity of Christ.

(2) *Principles of Ebionism.* We must distinguish between the earlier Ebionism and the later Ebionism as it was developed under the influence of the Alexandrian philosophy. Earlier and later Ebionism agreed in maintaining that the true God is the maker of the world and the author of the Mosaic law; in holding that Jesus was the Messiah, but not divine; in rejecting and abominating Paul, and in venerating James and Peter. The earlier Ebionites were ascetics, and exalted virginity. At that time, James, bishop of Jerusalem, brother of Jesus, was their hero. At a later time, when the ascetic spirit had been developed in the Gentile churches, they returned to the Judaic spirit and exalted marriage above virginity. Peter now became their hero.

Many shades of opinion regarding the person of Christ can be distinguished among the Judaizing Christians of the early centuries. Some held to the purely human generation of Jesus, while others acknowledged his supernatural birth.[1] Some modern writers distinguish between Pharisaic Ebionites and Essenic Ebionites, the former term denoting those who held fast to the current Jewish legalism and who were free from the influence of theosophy, the latter denoting the theosophical forms of Jewish Christian thought.

Cerinthus, educated in Alexandria but active chiefly in Asia Minor, to refute whose teachings the Fourth Gospel is said to have been written, was the first noted Ebionite of the speculative type. According to Irenæus and Hippolytus,[1] he held that the world was not made by God but by an ignorant being. "He represented Jesus as not having been born of a virgin . . . but as having been the son of Joseph and Mary, born after the manner of other men, though distinguished above all others by justice and prudence and wisdom. He taught, moreover, that after the baptism of Jesus the Christ descended upon him in the form of a dove from that Sovereign Power which is over all things, and that he then announced the unknown Father and wrought miracles; but that toward the end the Christ departed again from Jesus, and Jesus suffered and rose from the dead, while the Christ remained impassible as a spiritual being."

---

[1] Origen, "*Contra Celsum,*" V., 61.

Eusebius quotes Caius (latter part of the second century) to the effect that Cerinthus was a propagator of chiliastic views, which, as he claimed, were "shown him by angels." "And he says that after the resurrection the kingdom of Christ will be set up on the earth, and that the flesh dwelling in Jerusalem will again be subject to desires and pleasures. And being an enemy of the Scriptures of God, he asserts, with the purpose of deceiving men, that there is to be a period of a thousand years for marriage festivals." Eusebius quotes also Dionysius of Alexandria to the effect that Cerinthus "dreamed that the kingdom would consist in those things which he desired, . . . that is to say, in eating and drinking and marrying . . . and in festivals and sacrifices and the slaying of victims."[2] It is probable that Cerinthus' views of a temporal reign of Christ are somewhat caricatured by these writers.

The term "Ebionite" (of Hebrew derivation) means "poor," and was applied to the early Christians in general, who were poor in earthly goods and poor in spirit. The use of it was continued by the Judaizing party or was applied to them by their enemies. Some of the Jewish Christians of the second and third centuries were called "Nazarenes." This term also was sometimes applied to the early Christians as followers of Jesus of Nazareth (Acts 24 : 5). It may have adhered to certain communities of Jewish Christians from the earliest time. Ebionites and Nazarenes were probably separate parties in the third and fourth centuries. Epiphanius represents the latter as the more orthodox and as acknowledging the supernatural birth of Christ.

---

[1] Irenæus, Bk. III., Chap. 11; Hippolytus, Bk. VII., Chap. 33.
[2] "Church History," Bk. III., Chap. 28.

According to Eusebius,[1] Symmachus, who made a new translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek about the close of the second century, was an Ebionite. "The Gospel according to the Hebrews," which appears not to have been the Hebrew original of our Matthew, was in common use among the Ebionites.

(3) *Elkesaite Ebionism as seen in the Clementines.* The Clementine "Homilies" and "Recognitions" are among the most curious products of the religious movements of the second century. Judaism had been outlawed by the empire, and was despised by Gentile Christians and Gnostics. It occurred to some Jewish Christian, or Christians, to compose books purporting to have been written by Clement of Rome (the third pastor of the Roman Church, one of whose genuine Epistles we have), and of which the materials should be the supposititious discourses and acts of Peter. This would afford an excellent opportunity for combating the now dominant Paulinism, as represented by the Gentile Christians in general, and in a grossly perverted form by the Gnostics. Simon Magus is made to take a prominent place, and to have frequent encounters with Peter, who confounds him in argument and drives him away. Here we have, drawn out in supposed debates between Peter and Simon, a speculative Ebionitic system, somewhat analogous to those of the Gnostics. Peter declares that he will believe nothing against God or the righteous men of the Old Testament time, even though recorded in Scripture. The Old Testament Scriptures are not infallible, but contain much that is false, along with divine truth. Adam and Christ are identified (probably in opposition to the Pauline antithesis, Rom. 5), and constitute the true prophetic spirit in all ages. Along with Adam or

---

[1] "Church History," Bk. VI., Chap. 17.

Christ, was created a female nature as a companion, differing from the former as quality from substance, as the moon from the sun, as fire from light. She was entrusted to be the first prophetess. Everything, therefore, in the Old Testament that seems contrary to the righteousness of God and the patriarchs, is to be attributed to this inferior earthly prophecy, which has misled and perverted mankind. The male principle is wholly truth, the female wholly falsehood. He that is born of male and female, in some respects speaks truth; in others, falsehood. Moses did not write the law himself, but delivered it orally to seventy wise men. Afterward it was written down, but was burnt in the time of Nebuchadnezzar. Hence, as we now have it, the law contains false and true elements. Christ is declared to be begotten and sent, and hence infinitely inferior to the Father. Here, as in all the Gnostic systems, the question as to the origin of evil comes forward. Peter's main object in his disputes with Simon Magus is to vindicate the God of the Old Testament from all imputations of evil. Simon Magus maintains that if evil and the devil exist, and if God is the maker of all things, then God is the author of evil; hence, not himself good. Peter admits that the devil was created by God, but not that God created evil. God created four substances—heat, cold, moist and dry, simple and unmixed. When they were mingled there arose freedom of choice between good and evil. God permits the devil to exist and to rule over the world, in order that he may punish the wicked. The souls of men, as in the Pythagorean philosophy, are particles of light. Purgatory, something like the Platonic, with the annihilation of the incorrigible, is spoken of. Ebionism showed an extraordinary capacity for uniting with whatever foreign elements it came in contact with. Here we see it united with Pythagorean and Platonic elements. Some of these elements, but not all, are attributed to Ebionites in general by the Christian writers. The points given as common to all are the essentials. In the minds of speculative men endless variations of view found place.

The Clementine writings, and probably the Ebionites in general, laid the utmost stress on baptism. This was due in part to their belief that Jesus became Christ, or was adopted as Son by the Father, in connection with his baptism. Some of the more striking passages are the following:

In "Recognitions," I., 39, it is said that "lest haply they (the Jews) might suppose that on the cessation of sacrifice there was no remission of sins for them, he [God's Prophet—Christ] instituted baptism by water amongst them, in which they might be absolved from all their sins on the invocation of his name. . . Subsequently also an evident proof of this great mystery is supplied, in that every one who, believing in this Prophet who had been foretold by Moses, shall be kept unhurt from the destruction of war which impends over the unbelieving nation." This last probably has reference to the favorable treatment accorded to the Christians as compared with the cruel punishment inflicted on the Jews by Hadrian (135 onward).

In "Recognitions," II., 71, a person who has believed is said to need "the purification of baptism, that the unclean spirit may go out of him, which has made its abode in the inmost affections of his soul," and that he may eat with those who have been purified.

In "Homilies," VII., 8, God's service is said to be, "to worship him only, and trust only in the Prophet of truth, and to be baptized for the remission of sins, and thus by this pure baptism to be born again unto God by saving water," etc.

In "Recognitions," VI., 8, 9, after representing water as the first created thing and as that from which all things are produced, and dwelt on its regenerating efficacy, the writer proceeds: "And do you suppose that you can have hope toward God, even if you cultivate all piety and all righteousness, but do not receive baptism? Yea, rather, he will be worthy of greater punishment, who does good works not well. . . Now God has ordered every one who worships him to be sealed by baptism; but if you refuse, and obey your own will rather than God's, you are doubtless contrary and hostile to his will. But you will perhaps say, What does baptism of water contribute toward the worship of God? In the first place, because that which hath pleased God is fulfilled. In the second place, because, when you are regenerated and born again of water and of God, the frailty of your former birth, which you had through men, is cut off, and so at length you shall be able to attain salvation; but otherwise it is impossible. . . Betake yourselves therefore to these waters, for they alone can quench the violence of the future fire; and he who delays to approach them, it is evident that the idol of unbelief remains in him, and by it he is prevented from hastening to the waters which confer salvation. For, whether you be righteous or unrighteous, baptism is necessary for you in every respect: for the righteous, that perfection may be accomplished in him and he may be born again to God: for the unrighteous, that pardon may be vouchsafed him of the sins which he committed in ignorance."

Notwithstanding their belief in the magical efficacy of baptism, it is not probable that the Ebionites administered it to infants. The fact that Jesus was baptized as a mature man and their profound conviction that he first received his divine Sonship in baptism would probably have held them to adult baptism after it had become common among the non-Jewish Christians, who in general attached no such importance to the baptism of Jesus.

2. *The Gnostics.*

LITERATURE: Irenæus, "*Adversus Hæreses*"; Hippolytus, "*Refutatio Omnium Hær.*"; Tertullian, "*De Præscriptionibus Hæreticorum*," "*Adversus Marcionem*," etc.; Clement of Alex. and Origen, *passim;* Epiphanius, "*Adversus Hæreses*"; Plotinus, "*Ennead.*," Bk. II., Chap. 9; "*Pistis Sophia*" (a Gnostic Treatise recently discovered, and edited by Petermann, Berlin, 1853); Theodoret, "*De Hæreticorum Fabulis*"; Eusebius, "*Hist. Eccl.*," *passim;* Gieseler, "Ecclesiastical History," Vol. I., p. 129, *seq.;* Vol. II., p. 442, *seq.;* Möller, Vol. I., p. 129, *seq.;* Hilgenfeld, "*Ketzergesch.*"; King, "The Gnostics and their Remains," second ed., 1887 (sympathetic with Gnosticism and rich in archæological materials); Lightfoot, "The Colossian Heresy" (in "Com. on Colossians"); Harnack, "*Dogmengesch.*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 158, *seq.* (also English translation); Neander, Vol. I., p. 566, *seq.;* Pressensé, "Heresy and Christian Doctrine," p. I., *seq.;* Mansel, "The Gnostic Heresies"; Burton, "Heresies of the Apostolic Age"; Bunsen, "Hippolytus and His Age," Vol. I., p. 61, *seq.;* Baur, "*Die Chr. Gnosis*" (more concisely in his "Church History of the First Three Centuries," Vol. I., p. 185–245); Ritschl, "*Altkath. Kirche*," *passim;* Lipsius, "*Die Quellen der ältest Ketzergeschicte*"; Harnack, "*Zur Quellenkritik der Gesch. des Gnosticismus*"; Matter, "*Hist. Crit. du Gnosticisme*"; Lipsius, "*Der Gnosticismus, sein Wesen, Ursprung, Entwickelungsgang*"; Möller, "*Gesch. d. Cosmologie d. griechischen Kirche bis an Origines*"; Amelineau, "*Essai sur le Gnosticisme egyptien*"; Bright, "Gnosticism and Irenæus" (in "Waymarks of Church History," 1894); Köstlin, "*Die gnostische System d. Buch Pistis Sophia*" (in "*Theol. Jahrb.*," 1854); Merx, "*Bardesanes von Edessa*"; Koffmane, "*Die Gnosis nach ihrer Tendenz u. Organisation*"; Meyboom, "*Marcion en de Marcioniten*"; Gruber, "*Die Ophiten*"; Heinrici, "*Die Valentin. Gnosis u. d. Heil. Schriften*"; "Gnosticism," in Herzog-Hauck; Lichtenberger; Wetzer u. Welte; "Britannica" (ninth ed.), "Dictionary of Christian Biography," and Schaff-Herzog.

The term includes various theosophical bodies, with Christian elements, that flourished during the second century in Syria, Egypt, Asia Minor, etc.

(1) *The Germs of Gnosticism* existed, doubtless, in the apostolic times. Paul speaks of knowledge (γνῶσις) as "puffing up," of "oppositions of knowledge (γνῶσις) falsely so called," etc. In the writings of John we see

still clearer evidences of Gnostic opposition to Christianity. In Revelation the Nicolaitans are spoken of as holding the doctrine of Baal, and eating things sacrificed to idols. These were probably Gnostics. Irenæus testifies that the Gospel of John was written to oppose Gnosticism as represented by Cerinthus, an Ebionitic Gnostic. So, in the First Epistle of John, Gnostic tendencies are combated in the two-fold aspect of denial of the Divinity and denial of the humanity of Christ (Docetism). Simon Magus, who, according to the narrative in Acts, gave himself out as "the great power of God," became an arch-heretic (unless all of the accounts of him are legendary, like that of the Clementines), and the precursor, if not the founder, of Gnosticism. He is related to hav gained many followers, and to have called himself the "Word," "Paraclete," "Omnipotent," etc.[1]

(2) *The Philosophical Basis of Gnosticism* was the question as to the origin of evil. The answer was influenced by an idealized conception (Platonic and Pythagorean—seen also in the writings of Philo of Alexandria, etc.) of Absolute Being. The world was seen to be full of imperfection; the Supreme Being could not, therefore, be its author. The Old Testament represents Jehovah (or Elohim) as the creator of the world. Hence Jehovah is an imperfect being, and the religion of the Jews antagonistic to true religion. The chief aim of Gnosticism was to account for the existence of the present order of things without compromising the character of the Supreme Being.

(3) *Sources of Gnosticism.* The most direct and most important source of Gnosticism was the Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy as represented by Philo. We car account for most of the phenomena of Gnosticism by the supposition of attempts to combine this mode of thought with Christian doctrines, especially with the prologue of John's Gospel. Many points of resemblance can be traced between the Gnostic systems and the Jewish Cabbala, the germs of which probably existed in the second century; but it is impossible to tell whether Gnosticism borrowed from the Cabbala, or *vice versa.*

---

[1] Justin, "Apol.," I., Chap. 26; Irenæus, Bk. I., Chap. 23.

Both were certainly dependent on Jewish-Alexandrian theosophy. In addition to this chief element, the Gnostic systems (some to a greater, some to a less extent) were influenced by Buddhism and Zoroastrianism, which systems had long been well known in Alexandria. The esoteric theosophy of the old Egyptian religion must have contributed a not unimportant factor to Egyptian types of Gnosticism. The intensely dualistic systems are doubtless connected with the Zoroastrian and old Babylonian dualism. So also its emanation theories. With Buddhism may have been connected the Gnostic teachings respecting the antagonism of spirit and matter, the unreality of derived existence, and, to some extent, the origin of the world from successive emanations from the Absolute Being.[1] Yet it is not necessary to suppose a direct and conscious employment of all these sources. These had more or less influence on the Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy current at the time. Such ideas had become common property, and the special combinations in the hands of men of speculative minds who had cut loose from the historical, and sought only to devise plausible systems, is easily accounted for. Philo, under the influence of Neo-Platonism, Neo-Pythagoreanism, and old Egyptian theosophy, had exalted the Supreme Being above contact with the visible world, and had explained all passages of the Old Testament that seemed inconsistent with such exaltation, as referring not to the Absolute Being, but to a derived being, the Logos. He had adopted an allegorical method of interpretation, according to which the literal meaning of the Old Testament was of no account, and a given passage could be made to mean anything whatsoever, according to the fancy of the interpreter.

Philo's Logos doctrine is obscure from the fact that he employed the term in several different senses, viz: *a*. As a divine *faculty*, whether of thought or of creation, or of both together; *b*. as the thinking, creative activity of God; *c*. as the result of thinking, or the ideal world itself; *d*. as the active divine principle in the visible world.[2] The very obscurity and ambiguity of Philo would furnish endless material for speculation. So far as the dependence of the later theosophical systems is concerned, it is a matter of little importance whether Philo, in any of his representations of the Logos, meant to teach the existence of the Logos as a distinct personality. Certainly there is abundant material in Philo that could be so employed by uncritical speculative theologians.

---

[1] *Cf.* Mansel, "Gnostic Heresies," p. 32.

[2] See Dorner, "Person of Christ," Div. I., Vol. I., p. 24, *seq.*

Only in those systems in which Oriental features are marked is there need to suppose any direct connection with Zoroastrianism and Buddhism.

(4) *Characteristics of Gnosticism. a. Dualism*, in some systems absolute, in others not. Matter being regarded as evil could not have been created by the Supreme Being. *b. Docetism*, according to which the Messiah's body was only an appearance; or, according to others, a mere human body temporarily made use of by the Messiah. This docetism was the result of a theory of the inherent evil of matter. *c. Emanations*. Most of the Gnostic systems are characterized by a series of æons or emanations from the Supreme Being; the more remote, in general, the more degraded. One of the most degraded of the emanations figures as the Demiurge or world-framer. *d. Hostility to Judaism*, with some, absolute, Jehovah being regarded as positively malignant and actively hostile to the true God, and hence the Jewish religion, as entirely diabolical; with others, more moderate, Jehovah being regarded as an ignorant and imperfect being, and Judaism being regarded as a preparation for the revelation of the Supreme being in Christ. *e*. As the Ebionites rejected the writings of Paul and regarded Paul as an impostor, so the Gnostics rejected not only the Jewish religion and Scriptures, but *all of the New Testament except the Pauline Epistles and parts of the Gospels*, Peter and James being regarded as servants of the Demiurge, who tried to keep the people whom Christ had come to free in the slavery of the Demiurge. *f*. Gnosticism was essentially a *striving after system*. Unsatisfied with detached truths, men felt impelled to bring all truth into absolute harmony. It was speculative and not practical, conduct being regarded as entirely subordinate to comprehension of the mysteries of the universe. *g*. Gnosticism was an *aristocratic* system. A man was

regarded as exalted in the scale of being in proportion to his knowledge, not of facts, however, but of supposed mysteries. The great mass of mankind were *sarkical* (fleshly, animal); a part *psychical* (capable of reasoning about earthly matters); the Gnostics themselves were *spiritual* (capable of apprehending the divine mysteries). *h.* The Gnostic systems were all *fatalistic:* Man is in his present condition, not from his own choosing, but from the method of his creation; from this state he can do nothing toward freeing himself; he is absolutely dependent upon the aid that comes from without. *i.* As matter was regarded as evil, the Gnostics had *great contempt for the flesh.* Some of them practised the most rigid asceticism, in order to overcome the flesh; others held that everything depended upon the spirit and that the indulgence of the flesh was a matter of indifference, and gave the utmost license to their fleshly inclinations; while others held that the flesh ought to be destroyed by vice. Some of the Gnostics, regarding all the characters that are reprobated in the Old Testament (as Cain, the inhabitants of Sodom, etc.) as really servants of the true God, thought that the vices of these ought to be imitated. *k.* Gnosticism is distinguished from other theosophical systems—and hence demands consideration in the study of church history—from the fact that it embraces the idea of *redemption through Christ*, a Divine interposition in the world, in connection with the origin of Christianity, to deliver the world from the dominion of evil.

The opposition of the two principles, with the Dualism resting thereon, and the Gnostic repugnance toward anything material; the succession of æons, through which the relation of God with the world is sought to be mediated, but in the place of the Jewish-Christian idea of a free creation of the world the doctrine of the emanation of the world from God is posited; the separation of the Creator of the world from the one Supreme God; the putting of Christ in the same category with other divine beings whose sameness of nature can only be looked upon as an infringement upon the absolute dignity of Christ; the whole process of cosmic development in which Christianity is so completely entangled that the facts of redemption achieved through Christ must lose not only their ethical-religious meaning, but even their historical character—all this formed a very decided opposition to the fundamental intuition of the Christian consciousness. . . On the other side, Gnosticism had so much that was related to Christianity and in agreement with it, and as soon as

Christianity had once come to be more widely disseminated among the higher classes, every educated man initiated in the dominant ideas of his time felt so keenly the need of himself answering the same questions with whose solution the Gnostics were occupied, that the relation of Christianity to Gnosticism could be, by no means, a merely hostile and repellent one.[1]

(5) *Gnostic Systems.* Gnosticism was so speculative in its nature, that each important leader, even when adopting with little or no change the conceptions of his predecessors, was likely to invent a new terminology. This fact resulted in the almost endless multiplication of Gnostic parties, each of which is known by the name of its founder or by some peculiarity of the terminology or the imagery employed to set forth its ontological and cosmological scheme. Egypt and Syria were the great seminaries of Gnosticism, but Rome, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Armenia, and Eastern Persia furnished fruitful soil for its propagation.

a. Early Christian tradition made *Simon Magus*, after Peter's denunciation of his unholy proposal to purchase the power of bestowing the Holy Spirit (Acts 8 : 18–24), a malignant opponent of apostolic Christianity and an influential disseminator of pestilential heresy. This Simon of Samaria is said to have associated with himself a disreputable woman named Helena, and the two are said to have been worshiped by many of the Samaritans as the male and female principles of deity.[2] He is said to have claimed to be the Word, the Paraclete, and the Omnipotent One, and to have declared Helena to have been the first conception of his mind. Through her the angels and powers of the lower world had been produced, and through these angels the world had been framed. He himself and not Jesus, whom he regarded as a mere man who had received a divine impartation at his baptism, was the true Redeemer of mankind. His system seems to have been based on the Syro-Phœnician cosmology and to have had an elaborate angelology and a well-developed astrology. These elements were freely used in the practice of sorcery. The most noted of Simon's immediate disciples was Menander, who seems to have been content with propagating the views of his master, but to have put himself in the place of honor instead of Simon.

---

[1] Baur, "*Die drei ersten Jahrhunderten,*" pp. 247, 248.

[2] Justin Martyr, "Apol.," I., 26, 56, "Dial. with Trypho," 120.

b. Saturninus, the founder of Syrian Gnosticism, is said to have been a disciple of Simon and Menander. According to Irenæus (I., 24) he "taught that there is one Father unknown to all, who made angels, archangels, powers, and principalities; that the world and all that is therein was made by certain angels, seven in number; and that man was made by the angels." He was fashioned after the likeness of a bright manifestation of supreme power; but being unable to stand, "the superior power pitying him, . . sent a spark of life, which raised him upright." "The God of the Jews . . . was one of the angels, and because the Father wished to depose all the principalities from their sovereignty, Christ came to depose the God of the Jews, and for the salvation of those who trust in him; that is to say, of those who have in them the spark of life." Marriage and procreation he attributed to Satan. He rejected animal food and practised a rigorous asceticism. He denied the human birth of the Saviour and regarded his body as a mere appearance.

c. Tatian, a learned rhetorician, who had been converted to Christianity through Justin Martyr at Rome (*c.* 155), and had written an apology for Christianity (*c.* 165), was perverted to Syrian Gnosticism shortly afterward and wrote the "Diatessaron," in which he combined the four Gospel narratives into one, eliminating the genealogies and all passages referring to our Lord's Jewish descent (*c.* 175). He advocated and practised extreme asceticism, condemning marriage and the use of animal food, and using water for wine in the Supper. He regarded the creation of the world and the Old Testament revelation as the work of an imperfect Demiurge. The "Diatessaron" in its Syriac form was in common use in Syria till the fifth century. Tatian had vastly more knowledge of historical Christianity than had most of the Gnostic teachers.

d. Basilides, a man deeply versed in Greek and Jewish Alexandrian philosophy and in old Egyptian theosophy, and who may have come under the influence of the teachings of Simon Magus and Menander, appeared in Alexandria as a religious leader about 133. His philosophy was fundamentally pantheistic. His favorite designation of God was the "Non-existent One." He starts out with an absolute void and seeks to account for the phenomenal world. Hippolytus attributes to him the following statement:

> Since, therefore, there was nothing, neither matter nor substance, nor unsubstantial, nor simple, nor compound, nor inconceivable, nor imperceptible, nor man, nor angel, nor God, nor in short any of the things that are named or perceived by the senses or conceived by the intellect, but all things being thus, and more minutely than thus, simply obliterated, the non-existent God . . . without thought, without sense, without counsel, without choice, without passion, without desire, willed to make a world. When I say willed, I mean to signify without will and without thought and without sense; and by the world I mean not that which was afterward made and separated by size and division, but the seed of the world. . . Thus the non-existent God made a non-existent world from things non-existent, having cast down and deposited a single seed, having in itself the universal seed of the world.

This seed contained the three-fold sonship, of the same essence as the non-existent God. The first was purely spiritual, the second was thought of as the more refined material essences (the firmament and the atmosphere), the third seems identified with the spiritual essence connected with material substance of the grosser sort and as in need of purification. After the firmament had been formed there sprang forth out of the seed of the world the Great Ruler (*Archon*), "the wisest and most powerful and brightest of mundane existences, superior to all beneath, except that portion of the divine sonship which still remained in the world." Ignorant of what was above the firmament and thinking himself supreme, he undertook the work of creation. Having begotten a son more powerful than himself and seated him on his right hand, he unwittingly accomplished the counsel of the non-existent God in forming the celestial and the ethereal creation. The celestial and ethereal spheres and their rulers constitute the Ogdoad, and the Great Archon bears the mystical name Abrasax, the value of whose letters makes the number 365. This would seem to identify the Great Archon with the sun and to show the relationship of the system to the current sun-worship.

In the lower sphere a second Archon is developed who forms the Hebdomad, who also begins with the begetting of a son greater than himself. This second ruler is identified with the God of the Jews and the framer of this lower world. The third sonship is the portion of the divine life and light that has become imprisoned in matter, and the work of redemption consists in the liberation of this divine substance and its lifting up through the Hebdomad and the Ogdoad into the infinite.

Basilides secured a large following in Rome as well as in Egypt, and the influence of his theosophizing was widespread. His writings, which consisted of a recension of the gospel narrative, liturgical works, and an exposition of his cosmological and soteriological system have perished, except the few fragments that are preserved by his opponents. But underneath the somewhat fantastic imagery there seems to have been serious and profound thinking on the great problems of being.

e. Valentinus, also a Greek-speaking Egyptian philosopher, appeared in Rome as the propagator of an elaborate cosmological and soteriological system about 135, and may have continued to labor there with some intermissions until about 160. His system is far the most elaborate and was far the most popular of those developed in Egypt. He seems to have remained in nominal connection with the regular churches until after his departure from Rome. His was the form of Gnosticism with which Irenæus came into closest contact and which was the occasion of the writing of his great work against heresies. The philosophical basis of his system was identical with that of Basilides; but he was not so careful as Basilides to insist on the original non-existence of God and everything. He starts out with Depth (*Buthos*) and Silence (*Sige*) as the eternal male and female principles. These project Mind and Truth, which in turn project Word and Life. These produce Man and Church (not the mundane). Rejoicing in their productivity, they produce and present to the Father ten æons, a perfect number. Man and Church project twelve æons, of which the last is Wisdom (*Sophia*). This lowest æon sought to emulate the Father by independently producing offspring. The result was an abortion, who ignorantly proceeded to create this world and to involve in matter a portion of the divine substance that he possessed. This Demiurge was identified with the God of the Jews, and the Old Testament Scriptures were regarded as inspired by him. Mind and Truth projected, thereupon, Christ and the Holy Spirit to restore Form, to destroy the abortion, Chaos and to comfort the sorrowing *Sophia*. The work of redemption is to liberate the spiritual nature in man from the evil material existence and the passions by which it is enslaved and to facilitate its escape into the *pleroma* (divine fullness). For this purpose the thirty æons are supposed to have joined in projecting Jesus, the great High Priest, whose incarnation was only apparent, and whose task it was to restore *Sophia* and all of the spiritual substance that had become diffused and enslaved through the Demiurge.

f. The "*Pistis Sophia*," the only important Gnostic writing that has reached us in a state approximating completeness, was probably writen in Greek late in the second or early in the third century, but is extant only in a Coptic version. It exhibits Gnosticism in a highly developed state and seems to make more of historical Christianity than did many Gnostic writings. The title consists of two Greek words meaning "Faith Wisdom." It is the name applied to a female æon, or emanation from the Supreme Light, who having caught a glimpse of the Supreme Light, became discontented with her position and consumed with a desire to return into the infinite. To punish her for this unholy ambition, Adamas, the ruler of her sphere, led her by a false light to plunge into chaos, where she was beset by evil spirits, eager to rob her of the light that she possessed. The visible world, including mankind, resulted from the commingling of light with darkness. The subject-matter of the book is a full exposition of the way in which Pistis Sophia, including all the light and life that humanity possesses, is delivered and restored.

Several mysteries, or secret initiatory rites, are here described, the efficacy of each being carefully explained. These mysteries, it may be presumed, were practised by the Gnostics themselves, the degree of attainment in Christian knowledge and in immunity from the powers of evil being marked by the number of mysteries through which they had passed.

The work is in the form of dialogues between the Saviour and his disciples. Mary Magdalene is the most frequent questioner, and she, along with John, is represented as surpassing the other disciples in spiritual insight.

Among the mysteries baptism occupies a prominent place. I quote from King some of the more interesting statements: "Then came forth Mary and said: Lord, under what form do Baptisms remit sins? I have heard thee saying that the Ministers of Contentions [accusing evil spirits] follow after the soul, bearing witness against it of all the sins that it hath committed, so that they may convict it in the judgments. Now, therefore, Lord, do the mysteries of Baptism blot out the sins that be in the hands of the Receivers of Contention, so that they shall utterly forget the same? Now, therefore, Lord, tell us in what form they remit sins; for we desire to know them thoroughly? Then the Saviour answered and said: Thou hast well spoken: of a truth those Ministers are they that testify against all sins, for they abide constantly in the places of judgment, laying hold upon the souls, convicting all the souls of sinners who have not received the mystery, and they keep them fast in chaos tormenting them. But these contentious ones cannot pass over chaos so as to enter into the courses that be above chaos; in order to convict the souls therefore receiving the mysteries, it is not lawful for them to force so as to drag them down into chaos, where the Contentious Receivers may convict them. But the souls of such as have not received the mysteries, these do they desire and hale into chaos: whereas the souls that have received the mysteries they have no means of convicting, seeing that they cannot get out of their own place; and even if they did come forth, they could not stop those souls, neither shut them up in their chaos. Hearken, therefore, I will declare to you in truth in what form the mystery of baptism remitteth sins. If the souls when yet living in the world have been sinful, the contentious receivers verily do come that they may bear witness of all the sins they have committed, but they can by no means come forth out of the regions of chaos, so as to convict the soul in the places of judgment that be beyond chaos. But the counterfeit of the spirit [probably equivalent to conscience] testifies against all the sins of the soul, in order to convict it in the places of judgment that be beyond chaos; not only doth it testify, but it also sets a seal upon all the sins of the soul, so as to print them firmly upon the soul, that all the rulers of the judgment place of the sinners may know that it is the soul of a sinner, and likewise know the number of the sins which it hath committed from the seals that the counterfeit of the spirit hath imprinted on it, so that they may punish the soul according to the number of its sins: this is the manner in which they treat the soul of a sinner. Now, therefore, if any one hath received the mysteries of baptism, those mysteries become a great fire, exceeding strong and wise, so as to burn up all the sins; and the fire entereth into the soul secretly, so that it may consume within it all the sins which the counterfeit of the spirit hath printed there. Likewise it entereth into the body secretly, that it may pursue all its pursuers, and divide them into parts—for it pursueth within the body the counterfeit of the spirit and Fate—so that it may divide them apart from the Power and the Soul, and place them in one part of the body—so that the fire separates the counterfeit of the spirit, Fate, and the Body into one portion, and the Soul and the Power into another portion. [According to this representation, human nature consists of five parts: conscience, or the registering and accusing element; fate or destiny, which implies the resist-less tendency toward evil that belongs to humanity thus constituted; the body, conceived of as evil and as a hindrance to the highest end of being; the soul in the more limited sense; and the power, which seems to mean the particle of deity that is the portion of each individual.] The mystery of baptism remaineth in the middle of them, so that it may perpetually separate them, so that it may purge and cleanse them in order that they may not be polluted by matter. Now, therefore, Mary, this is the manner whereby the mystery of baptism remitteth sins and all transgressions."[1]

Then follows Mary's interpretation of our Lord's saying, Luke 12 : 49–52: "I came to cast fire upon the earth: and what will I, if it is already kindled? But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished! Think ye that I am come to give peace in the earth? I tell you, nay; but rather division; for there shall be from henceforth five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three. This, saith Mary, signifieth the mystery of baptism which thou hast brought into the world, because it hath brought about dissension in the body of the world, because it hath divided the counterfeit of the spirit, the body and the fate thereof, into one party, and the soul and the power into the other party. The same is, There shall be three against two, and two against three. And when Mary had spoken these things the Saviour said: Well done, thou Spiritual One in the pure light, this is the interpretation of my saying."

This Gnostic explanation and justification of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration has a great advantage over those of other parties in that it seriously undertakes to explain the process. Human nature has in it five elements, three evil and damning in their character and tendency, and two fundamentally good. The problem is to separate these and to place an insuperable barrier between them. This is precisely the function of the mystery of baptism, which enters into the nature like a penetrating, searching fire and separates and keeps separate these elements, leaving the good elements free to proceed toward the glorious end of being.

(*g*) *Marcion*, a native of Pontus, went to Rome about 138 or 139 and became a member of the Roman church. Failing in an attempt to bring the church to his way of thinking, he felt constrained to organize his adherents into a separate church and to inaugurate an active propaganda. Within a few years he had built up a strong community in Rome and organizations of his followers had been formed in most of the provinces. He seems to have entertained the hope of gaining universal acceptance for his views. He was unquestionably a man of profound earnestness and of marked ability, and he labored in the spirit of a reformer. He was almost wholly free from the speculative spirit that permeated the Egyptian and the Syrian Gnosticism. He did not exalt knowledge above faith, he did not embody his views in fantastic imagery drawn from pagan cults, he did not distinguish, as did most Gnostics, between the esoteric doctrines understood by the select few and the exoteric teachings to be imparted to the masses. In fact it is doubtful whether he should be called a Gnostic at all.[1] He had become convinced that Judaism is evil and only evil, and his mission was to eliminate every vestige of it from the religion of Christ. Accepting the Old Testament as the genuine revelation of the God of the Jews, he declared that Jehovah could not be the same as the God of the New Testament. He based his conceptions of Christianity on the writings of Paul, and formed a New Testament canon embracing, besides these, a modified edition of Luke's Gospel. By a diligent study of the Old Testament, he gathered everything contained in it that could be interpreted in such a manner as to reflect on the character of Jehovah: everything anthropomorphic or anthropopathic, everything that could be construed into requirement or approval of immorality and cruelty. With the teachings of the Old Testament he contrasted the spirituality, the gentleness, the mercifulness, and the lofty morality of the life and the teachings of Christ. He denied that God is an object of fear; he is love and requires love alone of his children. Christ took absolutely nothing from the kingdom of the Demiurge. His birth, his physical life, and his death were merely apparent. Yet he laid the utmost stress upon the redemptive work of Christ, which he considered absolutely requisite for man's salvation.

---

[1] "The Gnostics and Their Remains," p. 141, *seq.*

Marcion seems not to have speculated as to the origin of evil. The Demiurge and his kingdom are apparently regarded as existing from eternity. Matter he regarded as intrinsically evil and he practised a rigorous asceticism.

Marcionism found ready acceptance in Mesopotamia and Persia, where dualism had existed from time immemorial, and persisted there for centuries. Its influence is apparent in Manichæism, which was far more remote from historical Christianity, in Paulicianism, which, in its purer forms, was almost free from dualism, and in early Armenian Christianity in general.

---

[1] *Cf.* Harnack, "*Dogmengesch.*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 197, *seq.*

(6) *Influence of Gnosticism on Christian thought and life.* During most of the second century and part of the third Gnosticism was highly aggressive and became widely diffused throughout the Christian churches. In some cases Gnostic teachers carried forward their propaganda as members of regular Christian churches, and were able to win many of the most intelligent members before their withdrawal became necessary. Few churches, it may be supposed, were wholly free from the presence and personal influence of parties imbued with Gnostic teaching. Professing, as did the Gnostics, to solve all the great problems of the universe and in most cases commending themselves to pious Christians by great earnestness and zeal and by ascetic living, they easily gained followers among those who were predisposed to speculative thinking and to asceticism, despite all the efforts of the teachers of sound evangelical truth. After several of the great Gnostic leaders had been excluded from fellowship in the regular churches, and their teaching had come to be denounced as heretical by churches that were able to resist their proselytizing efforts, it became comparatively easy for Christians to expose their errors and to put believers everywhere on their guard against them. The influence of Gnosticism on Christian life and thought is manifest in the following directions: *a.* Christian teachers were obliged to defend the apostolic faith against its able and seductive assailants. To do this effectively it was necessary for them not only to study the writings of the false teachers, but also to study more profoundly than they might otherwise have done the Old and New Testament Scriptures and the writings of the Greek philosophers on which the teachings of the heretics so largely rested. Such study led to the philosophical statement of Christian doctrines. Naturally the Greek philosophy, already deeply imbedded in current thinking, was the molding influence in the transformation of the unsystematized materials of the New Testament into the Christian dogmas

of the third and following centuries. *b.* The fondness of the Gnostics for "mysteries" or secret rites, which they drew largely from the Greek and Egyptian mysteries, and their introduction of elaborate and pompous liturgical services, no doubt stimulated in the regular churches a taste for similar accessories to worship. *c.* In general it may be said that Gnosticism led the way in the amalgamation of Christian and pagan thought and life that was to transform the religion of Christ and his apostles into the Christianity of the third and following centuries.

3. *The Manichæans.*

LITERATURE: Archelaus, "*Acta Disput. cum Manete*," in Routh "*Reliquiæ Sac.*," V., 3, *seq.* (Eng. tr. "Ante-Nic. Libr."), Alexander of Lycop. (Eng. tr. "Ante-Nic. Libr."); Titus Bostrensis, "*Contra Manichæos*"; Epiphanius, 66; Augustine, various tracts against Manichæans in "*Opera*," Vol. VIII., ed. Bened. (Eng. tr. in "Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers," First Series, Vol. IV., by Stothert and A. H. Newman, with notes by the latter); documents in Fabricius, "*Biblioth. Gr.*," V., 285, *seq.*, and VIII., 315, *seq.*, and in Photius, "*Bibliotheca*," cod. 179. Pressensé "Her. and Chr. Doctr."; Gieseler, I., 203, *seq.*, Schaff, II., 498, *seq.*; Mœller, I., 289, *seq.*; Neander, I., 478, *seq.*; Wegnern, "*Manichæorum Indulgentiæ*"; De Sacy, "*Mémoires sur Diverses Antiq. de la Perse*," 289, *seq.*; Beausobre, "*Hist. critique de Man.*"; Baur, "*Das Manichæische Religionssytem*"; art. "Mani," in Herzog, "Britannica," and "Dict. of Ch. Biog.," by Kessler, Harnack, and Stokes, respectively; Flügel, "*Mani, seine Lehre u. seine Schriften, aus dem Fihrist d. Abi Jakub an Nadim*"; Kessler, "*Untersuchungen zur Genesis d. Man. Rel. Systems*," and "*Mani, oder Beitrag zur Bekenntniss d. Religionsmischung im Semitismus*"; Mozley, "Manichæans," etc. (in "Ruling Ideas in Early Ages"); Cunningham, "St. Austin and his Place in the History of Christian Thought."

(1) *Characterization of Manichæism.* Manichæism is Gnosticism, with its Christian elements reduced to a minimum, and the Zoroastrian, old Babylonian, and other Oriental elements raised to the maximum. Manichæism is Oriental dualism under Christian names, the Christian names employed retaining scarcely a trace of their proper meaning.

(2) *Origin of Manichæism.* Christianity had been introduced into Persia at an early date and was either of a Gnostic character when first introduced, or soon became such from contact with the State religion. By the middle of the third century Christians were numer-

ous in Persia, and had made considerable impression upon the dominant Zoroastrianism. After a period of decline Zoroastrianism, in its original strongly dualistic form, was restored by the Sassanides about the middle of the second century. Mani, a Mesopotamian, who had been brought up in connection with a sect of old Babylonian origin, having been brought into contact with Christianity, conceived the idea (probably about 238) of blending Oriental dualism and Christianity into a harmonious whole. Supposing that Christianity had been corrupted by the preponderance of Jewish elements, he set to work, in Gnostic fashion, to eliminate all Judaizing elements, and to substitute therefor Zoroastrianism. He regarded himself, at the same time, as an apostle of Jesus Christ, and as the promised Paraclete. Mani was skilled in various sciences and arts—mathematics, astronomy, painting—and had an ardent, profound mind. He seems also to have had a highly attractive personality. He was thus enabled to spread his views with great rapidity. Driven from Persia, he is said to have traveled in India and China. Here he doubtless came in contact with Buddhism, from which he may have derived new elements for his theosophical system. Returning to Persia, he was greatly honored by the new king, but was ordered to be crucified by his successor (about 277).

(3) *Doctrines of Manichæism.* The most fundamental thing in Manichæism is its *absolute dualism.* The "kingdom of light" and the "kingdom of darkness," with their rulers, stand eternally opposed to each other. The victory is not doubtful, but belongs to the "kingdom of light." Inside of this dualism exists a sort of *pantheism*, *i. e.*, each element of the dualism is conceived of as a unity evolving itself into multiformity. From the ruler of the "kingdom of light" emanates the "mother of life." "The mother of life" generates the "primitive man," with a view to opposing him to the powers of darkness. "Primitive man" is worsted in the conflict, and appeals to the ruler of the "kingdom of light" for aid. "Primitive man" is raised again, but the "kingdom of darkness" has swallowed part of his armor, *i. e.*, part of his light. This stolen light formed the mundane soul, now mixed up with matter. The object of the

creation of the world was to liberate the light thus mixed up with matter.

(4) *Points of Contact with Christianity*. The "primitive man," who was withdrawn from the "kingdom of darkness," was placed in the sun as its principle of heat and light. This was identified with the Logos, or Son of God. All growth, whether of plants or of animals, is an effort of the fettered powers of light to escape from the powers of darkness, prompted by the heat and light of the Sun, or the Son of God. The ruler of the kingdom of darkness, seeing that the powers of light which he held were thus about to be liberated, resolved to create a being in whom these powers might be charm-bound. Man is formed from the longing of the powers of darkness for a form like that of the Sun-Spirit. The object was to concentrate all the powers of light into a single being that should be able to attract and retain the heavenly light. Man, thus created, consisted of two opposite principles—a soul like the kingdom of light, and a body like the kingdom of darkness. The higher nature was tempted by the lower, and the soul that would have ascended to the kingdom of light was divided by propagation. The object of the historical appearance of Christ in the world (his bodily manifestation was only an appearance—*Docetism*) was to aid the good principle in man to overcome the evil, and by this means to liberate the elements of light from their bondage.

(5) *Morals and Customs of the Manichæans*. The Manichæans were divided into two classes, the *elect* or *perfect* and the *auditors*. The former alone were admitted to the secret rites—baptism, communion, etc.,—which are supposed to have been celebrated with great pomp, in much the same way as they were celebrated by the Catholics a little later. The "elect" were a sacerdotal class, forming a sort of connecting link between the "auditors" and the "kingdom of light." The "elect" practised a Buddhist asceticism, possessing no property, abstaining from marriage, from wine, from animal food, were extremely careful not to destroy animal or vegetable life (on account of the elements of light they contained), and occupied themselves with contemplation and devotion. The "auditors," who always constituted

the bulk of the Manichæans, were allowed more freedom, and were supposed to participate in the holiness of the "elect," in consideration of bestowing upon them the necessaries of life. The Manichæans rejected the Old Testament, and treated the New Testament in the most arbitrary way, rejecting whatever seemed unfavorable to their views, and maintaining that even the apostles did not fully understand Christ.

(6) *Effects of Manichæism on the Regular Churches.* Absurd and unchristian as this system seems to us, it claimed to be the only true Christianity, and by its lofty pretensions and the personal power of many of its advocates drew much of the intellect of the age into its ranks. We may say that, in connection with other influences, it stimulated: *a.* The ascetical spirit, with degradation of marriage, the exaltation of virginity, the regarding of the sexual instinct as absolutely evil and to be overcome by all possible means. *b.* The introduction of pompous ceremonial into the church. *c.* The systematizing of Christian doctrine. *d.* Sacerdotalism, or the belief that ministers of religion are intermediaries between God and man, possessing, by virtue of their office, extraordinary power with God. *e.* As the result of this sacerdotalism, the doctrine of indulgences (though in its development other influences can be distinguished) was introduced into the church.

During the fourth and fifth centuries Manichæism gained great popularity in Italy and North Africa. In the West it came into more vital relations with Christianity, and for a time was a most dangerous rival of orthodoxy. Augustine, the greatest of the Latin Fathers, was for many years connected with the Manichæans and his modes of thought were greatly affected by this experience.

4. *The Monarchian Heresies.*

LITERATURE: See pertinent sections in the works on the History of Doctrine, by Harnack, Seebach, Loofs, Thomasius, Baur, Hagenbach, Shedd, Sheldon, and Fisher; Dorner, "The Person of Christ," Div. I., Vol. II.; Conybeare, "The Key of Truth," 1898; and articles on "Monarchianism," and on the various subordinate parties and their leaders in "Dictionary of Christian Biography," and the Herzog-Hauck "*Real-Encyklopädie.*"

The type of teaching represented by Theodotus and Paul of Samosata is commonly designated by German writers Dynamistic Monarchianism, as distinguished from the Modalistic Monarchianism of Noëtus, Praxeas, Sabellius, and Beryllus. In the one case the man Jesus is regarded as energized and exalted by the Divine Spirit, in the other the incarnation is regarded as only a mode of the Divine activity and manifestation.

(1) *Dynamistic Monarchianism*. *a*. *The Alogoi.* This term was applied by Epiphanius (*c*. 375) to those who in the second century opposed the Logos (Word) doctrine of John's Gospel. They are said to have rejected not only the fourth Gospel, but the Johannean Apocalypse and the Johannean Epistles as well. Epiphanius relates that they not only denied the eternity of the Logos as a person of the Godhead, but attributed the Johannean Gospel and Apocalypse to Cerinthus, who is elsewhere represented as the arch-enemy of the Apostle John. They sought to show that the Christology of the fourth Gospel was contradictory to that of the Synoptic Gospels, which, they claimed, know nothing of the eternal sonship. They are represented as having arisen in opposition to the Montanistic prophecy.[1]

b. The first representative of Dynamistic Monarchianism whose views have been recorded is *Theodotus* of Byzantium, who sought to propagate his views in the Roman church, about 190. According to an anonymous writer,[2] Theodotus held to the supernatural birth of Jesus, but insisted that he was a "mere man" until his baptism, when the Holy Spirit came upon him and bestowed upon him Divine attributes. This form of doctrine, known in the later times as Adoptionism, was condemned by the Roman Church.

c. *Paul of Samosata*, bishop of Antioch (260 onward), was for some time a sort of viceroy to Queen Zenobia of Palmyra. About 269 he was excommunicated by a great provincial synod, after years of bitter controversy. After the fall of Zenobia (272), the Emperor Aurelian sustained the party that had the approval of the Italian bishops, and excluded Paul from the use of ecclesiastical property. His views were widely propagated in Mesopotamia and Armenia, and his name was probably perpetuated in the great Paulician body, who have kept alive his form of doctrine till the present century. Like Theodotus and his followers he insisted on the absolute unipersonality of God. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one God, one person. Logos and Wisdom are attributes or faculties of God. Christ was begotten of Mary by the Holy Spirit, and at his baptism was energized by the divine Logos (Word). Yet he refused to identify Christ with the Logos. Thus he regarded Jesus as a divinely begotten man, energized by the Holy Spirit (or the Logos) and so exalted to Divine dignity and honor. Of his efficiency as the Saviour of men he seems to have entertained no doubt.

---

[1] See Epiphanius, "*Hæres.*," 50-54.

[2] By some supposed to have been Hippolytus, by others Caius. The extant fragments are published in Routh's "*Reliquiæ Sacræ.*" English translation in Ante-Nicene Library, American edition, Vol. V., p. 601, *seq.*

Only a few sentences from his writings have been preserved. The following are the most important, and may fairly represent his mode of thought:

> Having been anointed by the Holy Spirit, he (Jesus) was given the title of Christ. He suffered according to his nature, he worked miracles according to grace. For by his unflinching, unblenched will and resolution he made himself like unto God; and, having kept himself free from sin, he was made one with him, and was empowered to take up, as it were, the power to perform miracles. By means of these he was shown to have one and the same energy in addition to the will (*i. e.*, of God), and so received the title of Redeemer and Saviour of our race.

Again:

> The Saviour having approved himself holy and just, and having overcome by conflict and labor the sins of our forefather,—having won these successes by his virtue,—was joined with God, having by his progressive advances in goodness attained to one and the same will and energy with him. And having preserved the same undivided, he doth inherit the Name that is above every name, the reward of love that was vouchsafed to him.

Again:

> The Word is greater than Christ, for Christ became great through wisdom.

Again:

> Mary did not bring forth the Word, for Mary was not before the ages. But she brought forth a man on a level with ourselves. It is

the man that is anointed, not the Word. It is the Nazarene, our Lord, that was anointed.[1]

d. In the "*Acts of Archelaus*," purporting to be a record of a disputation between Archelaus, bishop of Karkhar, in Persia, and Mani, the heretical leader (latter part of third century), views similar to those of Paul of Samosata are set forth by the bishop. This fact would seem to indicate the prevalence of Adoptionist teaching in Persia and the neighboring parts of Armenia. "Tell me," says Archelaus, "upon whom the Holy Spirit descended as a dove? Also, who is it that was baptized by John? If he was perfect, if he was Son, if he was virtue (*i. e.*, Divine power), the Spirit could not have entered into him, inasmuch as one kingdom cannot enter into another. But whose voice sounding from heaven testified to him, saying: 'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased'?"

Archelaus asserts the Adoptionist view of the person of Christ in opposition to the docetism of Mani and the Gnostics. The idea of a Divine incarnation seems to have been inseparable, in his mind, from the view that the humanity was a mere appearance.

Regarding the persistence of the Adoptionist Christology in the East, see the section on the Paulicians in the next Period.

The Theodotians are represented as seeking to substantiate their views by a critical study of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, and as being much given to the study of the logical and mathematical works of the Greeks. They seem to have rejected the allegorical method of interpretation, and may be regarded as the forerunners of the Antiochian school.

It will be noticed that this view of the person of Christ is in essential agreement with that of the Ebionites; but there is no reason to suppose that Theodotus and his followers were related historically to the Judaizing heresy. The Adoptionist Christology seems to be implied in the "Shepherd" of Hermas, and possibly in Justin Martyr's "Dialogue with Trypho." It is probable that this type of teaching was early diffused in Mesopotamia, Persia, and Armenia. It was to become the prevailing form of teaching in Armenia, and to be perpetuated there by the Paulicians, who for centuries disputed the ground with the Gregorian party.

Modus- mode

(2) *Modalistic Monarchianism.* This term may be used to include the views of Noëtus and Sabellius, com-

---

[1] *Cf.* Conybeare, "The Key of Truth," Introduction, p. xciv., *seq.*

[illegible] [illegible]

It would be a mighty thing [illegible] that I could explain

bated by Hippolytus, those of Praxeas, elaborately refuted by Tertullian, and those of Beryllus of Bostra, whom Origen convinced of his error.

a. About 195, *Praxeas*, who had suffered severely for the faith in Asia Minor, visited Rome in order to prevent the recognition of the Montanists by the Roman bishop. When Victor, who had been favorably impressed by the representations of the Montanists, was on the point of giving them letters of commendation, Praxeas succeeded, as Tertullian puts it, in expelling the Paraclete and crucifying the Father, *i. e.*, in causing the condemnation of the Montanists, who claimed to be the organs of the Paraclete, and in spreading his Patripassian heresy. It does not appear that he gained many followers in Rome, but he visited Carthage afterward, and his propaganda there was very successful. About 210, Tertullian, now a Montanist, put forth the most powerful polemic against this type of teaching that the age produced.

b. *Noëtus of Smyrna* sought to propagate similar views either in Smyrna or in Ephesus, about the time of Praxeas' visit to Rome. When, some years after, he was condemned and excommunicated by the presbyters of his community, he claimed that he was guilty of nothing but "glorifying Christ." His disciple, Epigonus, propagated his views in Rome (*c.* 200 onward). The bishop, Zephyrinus, and his coadjutor and successor, Callistus, according to Hippolytus, secretly aided the propaganda. Cleomenes became one of the most active of the propagandists. Sabellius was won over to this mode of thought, notwithstanding the earnest efforts of Hippolytus to save him from this fate. Callistus, when he became bishop (217), felt obliged to condemn Sabellius, but is represented by Hippolytus as fostering a similar form of teaching.

It is difficult to get at the exact form in which Modalistic Monarchianism was taught by this party. We are almost wholly dependent on their adversaries, who wrote with such passion that we cannot but suspect unfairness of representation. They evidently regarded men like Hippolytus and Tertullian, who insisted on the absolute Deity of Christ, and yet distinguished him from the Father, as ditheists. They were equally convinced of the absolute Deity of Christ, but they refused to distinguish between Father and Son as different personalities. They identified Christ with the Father, and did not hesitate to attribute to God as God whatever can be attributed to God incarnate, including birth, suffering, and death. Hence the designation "Patripassian."

For further information about the Modalistic Monarchians, see the sections on Hippolytus and Tertullian in the next chapter.

III. REACTIONARY AND REFORMING PARTIES.

1. *The Montanists.*

LITERATURE: Tertullian, Montanistic writings, esp. "*De Corona*," "*De Fuga in Persecutionem*," "*Scorpiace*," "*Ad Scapulam*," "*De Monogamia*," "*De Pudicitia*," "*De Jejuniis*," "*De Virginibus Velandis*," "*De Palliis*" (Eng. tr. in Ante-Nicene Library); Eusebius, "Church History," V., 14–18 (based upon earlier documents; McGiffert's notes are of great value); Epiphanius, "*Hær.*," 48 and 49; Sozomen, "Church History," II., 32. Pressensé "Her. and Chr. Doctr.," p. 101, *seq.*; Mossman, "History of the Early Christian Church.," p. 401, *seq.*; Neander, Vol. I., p. 508, *seq.*; Schaff, Vol. II., p. 405, *seq.*; Mœller, Vol. I., p. 156, *seq.*; Bonwetsch, "*Gesch. des Montanismus*"; Harnack, "*Dogmengeschichte*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 353, *seq.*; Hilgenfeld, "*Ketzergesch.*," *Seit.* 591, *seq.*; De Soyres, "Montanism and the Primitive Church"; Bishop of Bristol, "The Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Century"; Uhlhorn, "Conflict Between Christianity and Heathenism"; Ritschl, "*Altkath. Kirche*," *Seit.* 347–583, *seq.*; Baur, "Church History of the Three First Centuries," Vol. I., p. 245, *seq.*, Vol. II., p. 45, *seq.*; Neander, "Anti-Gnosticus, or the Spirit of Tertullian"; Belck, "*Gesch. d. Montanismus*"; Ramsay, "The Church in the Roman Empire," p. 434, *seq.*; Schwegler, "*Der Montanismus u. d. Kirche d. zweiten Jahrhunderts*"; art. "Montanism" in the encyclopedias referred to above.

(1) *Characteristics of Montanism.* We may regard Montanism: *a.* As a *reactionary* movement against the innovations that were being introduced into the churches through the influence of Gnosticism and of paganism in general; especially against the emphasizing of knowledge at the expense of faith, against laxity of discipline in the churches, and consequently of morals in the members, against the merging of the churches in the world, against the growth of hierarchy, against the growing disbelief in contemporaneous special providences and revelations. whe

ge

b. As a movement *Judaistic* in its tendencies: not in the sense of exalting Judaism above Christianity, for the Montanists are decided in their preference for Christianity as a higher stage of divine revelation than Judaism; nor in the sense of adhering to Jewish forms and customs, for many things approved of in the Old Testament, as repeated marriages, the use of wine, etc., are reprobated by the Montanists; nor in the sense of Ebionitic denial of the divinity of Christ, for they maintained this most persistently. But *in spirit* the Montanists were Judaistic. They were legalists, attempting to make religion to consist largely in outward observances. They regarded themselves as occupying a position similar to that of the prophets of the Old Testament, with their ecstatic visions, etc.

c. We may say, that while in a sense Montanism was a reaction against innovation, it was yet *innovating in its tendencies*, and anticipated the post-Nicene churches that considered themselves "Catholic" in many of its most distinctive features. In general, the very features of Montanism which led to its rejection by the churches of the time were, within two centuries, part and parcel of the doctrine of these churches: *e. g.*, exaltation of virginity and widowhood, arbitrary division of sins into mortal and venial, undue exaltation of martyrdom, etc.

d. Hence, Montanism may be regarded as in one sense a forerunner of later reformatory bodies, but in a more important sense as a *forerunner of the ascetic Christianity* of the fourth and following centuries.

e. The Montanists *exaggerated the opposition between Christianity and the world*. They had an almost Gnostic contempt for the flesh, and believed that sensual pleasure of any sort was hurtful to the spiritual life. The present life they regarded as of no consequence except as a time of preparation for the life beyond. Montanism was, therefore, an impracticable system. In the nature of things, Christianity, in that form, could never become a universal religion.

f. Montanism may be *contrasted with Gnosticism* thus: Gnosticism was occupied chiefly with speculations as to the *origin* of the universe; Montanism with speculations as to the approaching *end* of the world.

g. Montanism may be *contrasted with Catholicism* of the time thus: Montanism insisted upon holiness—a legalistic and arbitrary holiness, it is true—at the expense of catholicity; Catholicism, *vice versa*.[1]

(2) *Origin of Montanism*. Montanism, as an organized party, originated in Phrygia, about 135–160. Montanus, with two women, Priscilla and Maximilla, claimed to have been especially enlightened by the Paraclete; and to have been divinely commissioned to proclaim the setting up of the kingdom of Christ on earth and to inveigh against the laxity and worldliness of the churches of the time. Their denunciation of the clergy, whom they stigmatized as *psychical* in contrast with their own spirituality, aroused the opposition of the clergy and the less earnest laymen. The Montanists were cut off from the communion of many Phrygian churches. Believing themselves to be the only true apostolic Christians, they appealed to their brethren at Rome and elsewhere for recognition. The Roman Church was about to recognize them, but owing to unfavorable representations of their doctrines and practices by Praxeas, noted for Patripassian views of the Godhead, the recognition failed and the prophets were rejected. The Montanists, against their desire and original intention, were thus forced into the position of schismatics. The movement was one that appealed forcibly to the more earnest Christians throughout the empire, and Montanistic churches multiplied in Asia Minor, in Proconsular Africa, and in the remote East.

The Phrygians were strongly predisposed to extravagance in religion. Their worship of Cybele was grossly immoral, and was accompanied by ecstatic visions, wild frenzy, and fearful self-mutilations. The enthusiastic, perhaps fanatical, character of early Montanism may have been due in part to this national characteristic.

(3) *Doctrines of the Montanists*. In general, the Montanists did not differ widely in point of belief from the orthodox churches of the time. Says Tertullian:[2] "They [the psychical] make controversy with the Paraclete; on account of this the new prophecies are rejected, not

---

[1] The last two observations are substantially Baur's.

[2] "*De Jejuniis*," Book I. *Cf*. "*De Virg. Velandis*," Book II.; Epiphanius, "*Hær*.," 48, 1; Firmilianus, in Cyprian, "*Ep*.," LXXV., 19.

that Montanus and Priscilla and Maximilla preach another God, nor that they do away with Jesus Christ, nor that they overthrow any rule of faith or hope." We can best get at their peculiarities of view by observing the charges made against them by their adversaries.

a. One of the most distinctive features of the Montanists is their *doctrine of the Paraclete.* They claimed to be the recipients, while in a state of ecstasy, of special divine revelations. They supposed that in their time and in them was fulfilled the saying of Christ: "I have still many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now, but when he comes, the Spirit of truth, he will guide you into the whole truth," etc. Accordingly, they regarded their own dreaming as of more importance than the written word. Says Tertullian:[1] "If Christ abolished what Moses taught, because from the beginning it was not so (Matt. 19 : 8), . . why should not the Paraclete abolish what Paul indulged, because second marriage also was not from the beginning?"

b. The points in which they claimed to be especially instructed by the Paraclete are chiefly those in which the Scriptures are not sufficiently ascetical, showing that the *most fundamental thing* was their *legalistic asceticism,* and that the Paraclete was with them an expedient for obviating the authority of Scripture in favor of greater rigor.

c. To particularize: The Montanists claimed the authority of the Paraclete for *making second marriages equivalent to adultery,* and hence mortal sin, which the church is incompetent to forgive; for *rejecting entirely the use of wine* and insisting on frequent and long-continued fasts, especially the *xerophagies* (or abstinence from moist food of any kind); for *making flight in persecution or denial of the faith under any circumstances mortal* (by the church unpardonable) *sin;* for *expecting the speedy end of the present dispensation.* Indeed, the motive for the Montanistic asceticism was the vivid expectation of the end of the world.

d. As indicated above, the Montanists drew a definite line—first, so far as we know—between *mortal* and *venial*

---

[1] "De Monogamia," Chap. 14.

1. Before law
2. under
Christ - Apostles
3. " "
4. etc - Montanists

sins: the former comprising homicide, idolatry, fraud, negation (of the faith), blasphemy, adultery, and fornication; the latter embracing all those minor sins to which every Christian is continually subject. The former are irremissible, so far as the churches are concerned; the latter are forgiven through the advocacy of Christ.

(4) *Influence of Montanism on the Church.* Few of the teachings and practices for which the Montanists are distinguished were new creations of the Montanists. Special prophetical gifts, *e.g.*, are spoken of by Justin Martyr and Irenæus as appearing in their time, and millenarianism was by no means peculiar to Montanism. But the Montanists brought forward their ideas and claims in an enthusiastic and one-sided way, having been aroused to fanaticism by the increasing corruption and worldliness of the churches. As worldliness and corruption continued to increase, so reactionary movements continued to appear until, when the great churches as such were thoroughly secularized by the union of Church and State, the reactionary spirit culminated, as we shall see hereafter, in monasticism.

2. *The Novatianists.*

LITERATURE: Cyprian, "*Epp.*," 41–52; Eusebius, "Ch. Hist.," Bk. VI., Chap. 43, 45; Bk. VII., Chap. 8; Socrates, "Ch. Hist.," Bk. IV., Chap. 28; Pacianus, "*Ep. Tres Contr. Nov.*"; (the extant writings of Novatian do not touch specifically upon the distinctive features of Novatianism); Neander, Vol. I., pp. 237–248; Gieseler, Vol. I., p. 254; Mœller, Vol. I., p. 263, *seq.*; Tillemont, "*Mémoires*," Tom. III., pp, 189, 209, 346, 353; Walch, "*Ketzerhistorie*," *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 185–310; Ritschl, "*Altkath. Kirche*," *Seit.* 335, 538, 575; Harnack, "*Dogmengesch*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 339, *seq.*; encyclopedias as above, *sub. voc.*

(1) *Characteristics of Novatianism.* *a.* After what has been said of Montanism, it will not be necessary to discuss Novatianism at length. Novatianism *was Montanism reappearing* under peculiar circumstances and in another age. Many of the Montanistic ideas had been absorbed by the general churches. The prophetic spirit could not long sustain itself. After the time of Tertullian we hear nothing of prophetic claims. Nor does this feature of Montanism reappear in Novatianism.

b. Novatianism was a *striving after ecclesiastical purity*, perverted by the Montanistic legalism. The churches must be made pure and kept pure by the rigorous exclusion of all who have at any time committed one of the particular sins which were arbitrarily classed as "mortal," especially negation of the faith.

250

(2) *Origin of Novatianism.* So far as the Novatianist party was a new party, it originated as follows: During the Decian persecution, many Christians in all parts of the empire denied the faith. At the close of the persecution, it was a most important question with the churches how to deal with the multitudes who now clamored for readmission. The laxer party, which was at this time predominant at Rome, was in favor of readmitting them without much delay or ceremony. An influential party, led by Novatian, opposed this laxity, and when they failed to carry their point in the church, withdrew, Novatian becoming bishop of the protesting party. The Novatianists had the sympathy of a large element in the North African churches, and they soon formed there a strong organization. In North Africa and in Asia Minor they probably absorbed most of the Montanistic party, which was still important. This was certainly the case in Phrygia, the original home of Montanism. Novatianist congregations persisted till the fifth century or later.

29 [illegible]

(3) *Doctrines and Practices.* *a.* In matters of doctrine and church organization, the Novatianists were at one with the general churches. Novatian himself wrote one of the ablest treatises of the period on the doctrine of the Trinity. It was the matter of *discipline* alone, the conditions of church-membership and the competency of the churches to forgive certain specific sins, that furnished occasion for the schism.

b. Believing the general churches of the time to be apostate, they naturally rejected their ordinances, and *rebaptized* those that came to them from churches with which they did not affiliate.

c. The doctrine of *baptismal regeneration* had become almost universal by this time, and the Novatianists held to it so tenaciously as to regard it as a matter of the utmost consequence, not only that every Christian should be baptized, but also that he should be baptized by a properly qualified person. [illegible] - Who were [illegible].

[illegible]

Same as [illegible]

3. *The Donatists.*

more like Baptists

LITERATURE: Optatus Milevitanus, "*De Schismate Donatistarum*," Lib. VII., ed. Dupin (this edition contains also a collection of documents relating to the history of the Donatists); Augustine, various treatises against the Donatists (Eng. tr. by King, edited, with elaborate introductory essay, by Hartranft, in Nicene and Post-Nic. Fathers, first ser., Vol. IV.); Norisius, "*Hist. Donatistarum*"; Hefele, "Councils," Vol. I. and II., *passim*; Hardouin, "*Conc.*," Vol. I., *passim*; Neander, Vol. II., pp. 214–252; Schaff, Vol. III., p. 360, *seq.*; Ribbeck, "*Donatus und Augustinus*"; Bindemann, "*Der heil. Augustinus*," *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 366, *seq.*; *Bd.* III., *Seit.* 178–353; Völter, "*Ursprung d. Donatismus*"; Walch, "*Historie der Ketzereien*," *Bd.* IV.; Roux, "*De Augustino, Adversario Donatistarum*"; Tillemont, "*Mémoires*," *Tom.* VI.; art. in the "Presb. Rev.," 1884, by T. W. Hopkins; Loofs, "*Dogmengesch.*," *Seit.* 205, *seq.*; Thümmel, "*Zur Beurtheilung d. Donatismus*," 1893; Seeck, "*Quellen u. Urkunden über d. Anfänge d. Donatismus*" (in "*Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*," 1889); Reuter, "*Augustin. Studien*"; Deutsch, "*Drei Actenstücke zur Gesch. d. Donatismus*"; art. "Donatism," in encyclopedias referred to above. The art. by Bonwetsch in the third ed. of the Herzog-Hauck "*R. E.*," *Bd.* IV., *Seit.* 788–798, 1898, is of special value and brings the literature up to date.

not new.

(1) *Characteristics.* *a.* The Donatists follow in the same general line with the Montanists and the Novatianists. Like the earlier bodies they were concerned chiefly with questions of ecclesiastical *discipline*; and, as in the earlier movements, their scrupulosity was based upon a narrow *legalism*.

b. The Donatists may properly be called the *High Churchmen* of the fifth century. Like many High Churchmen of modern times they were distinguished for their earnestness and zeal.

c. Their protests against the corruptions of the churches were entirely justified, but the spirit of their protests seems to have been more hopelessly at variance with true spiritual Christianity than that of their comparatively lax and indifferent opponents.

(2) *Origin.* The Donatists arose after the Diocletian persecution. Those who delivered up the Scriptures during persecution were stigmatized by the strict party as "traditors." The strict party could not endure the presence of traditors in the churches, especially as officers. As traditors had committed a sin which they felt that the churches had no right to pardon, they re-

garded ordinances performed by such persons as invalid, and churches in which they were tolerated as unworthy of Christian fellowship. Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, when called on to deliver up the Scriptures, was reported to have put in their place some heretical writings, and to have hidden the Scriptures themselves. He and Cæcilian, his deacon, used all their influence against the fanaticism which led so many needlessly to throw themselves into the hands of the persecutors. They also sought to check superstition as it was coming to be manifested in the worship of relics, etc. In 311 Mensurius died, and Cæcilian became candidate for the episcopate. In Numidia, several influential pastors, especially Donatus, of Casæ Nigræ, and Secundus, of Tigisis, had taken strong ground against traditors. A wealthy lady, Lucilla, much given to the veneration of martyrs and their relics, was at the head of the opposition in Carthage. The Carthaginian presbyters were almost all opposed to Cæcilian. The Numidian bishops, who were accustomed to take part in the consecration of the bishop of Carthage, were sent for by the party of Lucilla, and meetings were held in her house. Cæcilian knowing that he would be opposed by these bishops, got himself hurriedly ordained by a neighboring bishop, Felix, of Aptunga. The Numidian bishops declared Cæcilian deposed, and elected Majorinus. There were now two rival bishops of Carthage, each with a strong following, and the utmost bitterness prevailed between the two parties. The schism thus begun at Carthage, spread all over North Africa. Much of the earlier Montanism and Novatianism was probably absorbed by the new party. Indeed, the party can hardly be called new. It was simply a fresh manifestation of the strict tendency as opposed to increasing laxity in the churches.

(3) *Doctrines and Practices*. *a*. They insisted on rigorous ecclesiastical discipline, and pure church-membership. *b*. They rejected unworthy ministers. *c*. They protested against civil interference in matters of religion. This feature, however, was developed only after they had despaired of obtaining the support of the civil power. The evils of State interference must be experienced

before the system could be vigorously combated. *d.* They practised episcopacy in the same sense and to the same extent as it prevailed in the general churches of the time; though the dioceses were for the most part very small, and many bishops were pastors of single churches. *e.* They believed in baptismal regeneration and in the necessity of baptism to salvation. In this they went beyond the Catholics themselves, maintaining that the human nature of Christ himself needed to be cleansed by baptism. Their most prominent characteristic, that of baptizing anew those that had already been baptized, whether in infancy or not, by those whom they regarded as unworthy, is evidence of the fact that they regarded the salvation of the soul as depending on the administration of the ordinance by a blameless person. *f.* They practised infant baptism. This they were probably more scrupulous in doing than the general churches, in accordance with their more vivid sense of its necessity. *g.* They were intolerant and bigoted. This, however, was in a large measure due to the harsh treatment that they received at the hands of their opponents.[1]

---

[1] The later history of the Donatists will be found in the next period.

[illegible] when Donatists came to front
[illegible] were used immersion [illegible] before baptism
[illegible] required faith
Church practiced infant baptism
at [illegible] point of [illegible]
"He who accuses us of baptizing twice does
[illegible] baptize once". Donatists did not believe in
infant baptism
[illegible]

[illegible] infant [illegible] Catholic
Donatists rejected inf. [illegible]
[illegible]
3 Donatists: [illegible]
4.

CHAPTER III

O. K.

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE OF THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES

LITERATURE: Original texts in Migne's "*Patrologia*" and in critical editions to be referred to under each author; English translations in "The Ante-Nicene Fathers," 10 vols, New York, 1885–96; Harnack, "*Gesch. d. Altchristl. Litteratur bis zu Eusebius*," 1893 onward (Part I. consists of a comprehensive survey of the entire body of extant Christian literature so far as it had come to light at the time of writing, with full critical information regarding each document. Part II., of which the first volume was issued in 1897, treats of the chronology of these literary remains. This monumental work is being prepared under the auspices of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences); Gebhardt and Harnack, "*Texte und Untersuchungen*" (This learned work, still in progress, consists of monographs by various scholars on various literary monuments of this age, especially on newly discovered documents and such as are of uncertain date and authorship. Fifteen volumes have already appeared); Robinson, "Texts and Studies" (an English series of monographs by different writers similar to the German series just referred to, still in course of publication); Cruttwell, "A Literary History of Early Christianity," 1893; Krüger, "History of Early Christian Literature in the First Three Centuries," English translation, 1898; Donaldson, "A Critical History of Christ. Literature and Doctr. from the Death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council," 1866; Farrar, "Lives of the Fathers."

I. PRELIMINARY.

1. *The Importance of this Literature.*

THE Christian literature of the first three centuries stands next to that of the apostolic age not only in time but also in importance. Some of the writings to be here considered belong to the apostolic age and may be earlier than some of the New Testament books, especially the Johannean Gospel and Apocalypse. The importance of this literature is obvious from the following considerations:

(1) The distinct inferiority of the very best of it to any of the New Testament books is strongly confirmatory of the belief that the selection and the preservation of the

latter no less than their original writing was presided over by Divine Providence.

(2) This literature is our only source of information as to the process by which apostolic Christianity was transformed in doctrine, polity, life, worship, and institutions into the Christianity of the fourth century, and by which Christianity became so widespread, powerful, and secularized as to gain recognition as the religion of the State.

(3) These writings contain all the available information regarding the use of the New Testament Scriptures in the churches of the first three centuries and reveal the process by which, and the influences under which, the books now included in our canon secured recognition as the authoritative record of the revelation of the New Covenant to the exclusion of all others.

(4) This literature is remarkably varied as regards form, contents, and type of teaching, and is a true mirror of the diversified forms that Christianity assumed in its contact and conflict with the Jewish and the pagan world.

2. *Divisions of Early Christian Literature.*

We may divide early Christian literature as follows: (1) The *edificatory* period. (2) The *apologetic* period. (3) The *polemical* period. (4) The *scientific* period. We shall find that the order of division is at the same time logical and chronological.

(1) *An Obscure and Quiet Growth.* It was natural and necessary that Christianity should have an obscure and quiet growth before it should get bold enough to defend itself publicly, or at least before it could hope for a public hearing. Moreover, in the age immediately succeeding the apostolic age Christianity had in its ranks few men of philosophical culture who could have been expected to attempt the public defense of their religion. The shock received by the Christians from the atrocities of Nero, repeated in a somewhat milder form by Domitian, would have deterred them in any case from attempting to influence the government in their favor.

(2) *Warding off Attacks.* Again, it was natural, after Christianity had made considerable progress and had won to its support a number of cultured minds, that it

should devote its attention to warding off the attacks of its enemies and to setting forth to those in authority its true character, and should abstain as far as practicable from public attacks on heathen doctrines and practices. Not all of the apologists, as we shall see, were able entirely to refrain from ridiculing the absurdities and denouncing the terrible evils that were involved in the polytheistic worship of the time; but in general their attitude was that of suppliants for mercy.

(3) *A voice of Condemnation.* Again, it was natural, after Christianity had grown strong enough to regard itself and to be regarded as a mighty rival of paganism and as destined soon to supplant it, that it should lift up its voice in condemnation of the corruptions of paganism, especially as the Christians themselves were continually tempted to wrong-doing by the presence of heathen practices. Heresy, moreover, was aggressive and must be vanquished. Most of the polemical literature is directed against false forms of teaching.

(4) *A Scientific Study of Christianity.* Again, it was necessary that Christianity should have gained not simply a firm foothold, but should have had a period of comparative quiet and immunity from persecution, before a scientific study of the sacred books and an application to them of the philosophical modes of thought that belonged to the highest culture of the age should take place. This scientific study of Christianity was promoted by attacks upon Christianity by heretics and pagans and the general interest that cultivated men of all classes were beginning to show in Christianity. Men who were thoroughly familiar with Greek philosophy and with Gnostic speculations naturally sought to exhibit Christianity as the only true philosophy.

II. THE EDIFICATORY PERIOD, OR THE PERIOD OF THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

1. *General Characteristics.*

(1) *Informal Utterances.* The writings that fall under this head are simple, informal utterances of pious faith. No attempt is made at a systematic exhibition of Christian doctrine, any more than in the New Testament.

(2) *No Knowledge of Pagan Philosophy.* These writers betray no knowledge of pagan philosophy, hence no polemics against paganism occur. Little allusion is made to heresies. Such already existed, to be sure, but the writings that have come down to us are too much occupied with the internal interests of religion to allow of their entering formally upon their refutation; and few of the writers possessed the requisite learning for effectively meeting the theosophical errors of the time.

(3) *These Writings Show us Christianity at Work.* Individual responsibility is everywhere recognized. There is evidence that the missionary spirit was still thoroughly energetic. The type of piety represented in these writings is for the most part healthy and in accordance with the New Testament.

(4) *Revere Old Testament.* While these writers quote freely and lovingly from the New Testament books, it is the Old Testament that they reverence most of all, and to this only is final appeal made in support of doctrine. In other words, they use the New Testament for substance of doctrine, but the Old Testament for proof. The necessity that they felt of finding the whole of Christianity in the Old Testament led them to apply the allegorical method of interpretation in the most arbitrary manner. In this they but followed the example of the Alexandrian Jews and of contemporary pagan writers.

2. *Individual Writings.*

(*1*) *The First Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthian Church.*

LITERATURE: In addition to works referred to above, "*Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*," ed. Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn (this is by far the best edition of the "Apostolic Fathers." It contains prolegomena, Latin translations, with ample notes and critical apparatus); Wrede, "*Untersuchungen zum Ersten Clemensbrief*," 1891; Lemme, in "*Neu Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.*," 1892, *Seit.* 375, *seq.*; Lightfoot, "S. Clement of Rome" (the best edition of the ep., with Eng. trans. and all necessary apparatus); Zahn, in "*Zeitschrift für d. Hist. Theol.*," 1869; Gebhardt, in "*Zeitschrift. für Kirch.-Gesch.*," 1876; Wieseler, in "*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theol.*," 1875; encyclopedias before referred to, art. "Clement of Rome."

a. Authorship. The grounds for assigning the epistle to Clement are not decisive. The letter is addressed by "the church of God that sojourns at Rome to the church of God that sojourns at Corinth." Dionysius of Corinth, about 170, is the earliest known witness to its Clementine authorship.[1] Irenæus relates that, during the episcopate of Clement, the church of Rome sent a most appropriate letter to the Corinthians, exhorting them to peace and renewing their faith and calling to their remembrance the tradition that they had recently received from the apostles. He further relates that this Clement was the third in order of the Roman bishops, having been preceded by Linus, appointed by the apostles, and by Anacletus, and that Clement himself had seen the apostles and associated with them. The statement of Irenæus seems probable enough. According to this writer the epistle was still being used in religious services by the Corinthian church in his time.

Eusebius, whose chief authority on this point was probably Irenæus, but who also refers to Hegesippus, who had visited the Corinthian church in the latter part of the second century, may be wrong in ascribing the epistle to Clement *individually*. In Eusebius' time such a letter would have been sent by the bishop, as lord of his church. Hence he may have inferred that Clement, being bishop of the Roman church, himself wrote it. As one of the most influential and intelligent members of the church he may have prepared the letter, but if so, he did it as the representative of the church; hence the superscription. But supposing the letter to have been written by Clement, pastor of the Roman church in the time of Domitian, there is no absolute proof that this was the Clement mentioned by Paul in Phil. 4 : 3. The name was a very common one.

Some modern writers (Lipsius, Volkmar, Erbes, Hasenclever) have sought to identify Clement, the Roman bishop or presbyter, to whom the authorship of the epistle has been attributed, with Flavius Clemens, the consul and relative of the emperor, who suffered martyrdom under Domitian. This identification has been strongly opposed by Zahn, Wieseler, Funk, Harnack, and Uhlhorn.[2]

There has been much difference of opinion as to whether the writer of the epistle was a Jewish or a Gentile Christian. Lightfoot and Lemme contend for the former view, Harnack and Wrede for the latter, while Uhlhorn thinks the considerations adduced on neither side decisive.

---

[1] Eusebius, Bk. IV., chap. 23.

[2] See Uhlhorn, in "*Real-Encyklopädie*," third ed., *Bd.* IV., *Seit.* 165, *seq.*

b. Date of the Epistle. This is a disputed point, but it may be assigned, with some probability, to a time between A. D. 93 and 97.

(*a*) Reasons for believing it not earlier than 93: First, It must have been written considerably after the death of Peter and Paul, for their martyrdom is treated as a matter of history (chap. 5). So also their activity (chap. 42, etc.). Secondly, No mention is made of the strife between Jewish and Gentile Christians that had formerly prevailed at Rome and Corinth. Some time must have elapsed since Paul wrote his Epistles. Thirdly, The Corinthian church is spoken of (chap. 47) as *ancient*.

(*b*) Reasons for believing it not later than 97: First, The martyrdom of Peter and Paul is spoken of as belonging *to our generation*. Secondly, Presbyters are represented as still living who were appointed by the apostles. Thirdly, No mention is made of the disturbances created by Gnostics in the Roman church early in the second century. Fourthly, The Roman church is represented as having just come out of great tribulation (chap. 1). As there is no intimation that the Corinthians suffered at the same time, this persecution could hardly be the widespread one under Trajan, but was most probably a local persecution under Domitian (93–97).

c. Abstract of the Epistle. A sedition had arisen in the Corinthian church. A certain faction had deposed, without just grounds, some presbyters of the church. The writer begins, after the salutation, with excusing the delay of the Roman church in responding to the request for advice (the excuse being the severe persecution to which the Romans had been subjected), and calls attention to the high repute in which the Corinthian church had hitherto stood. The sedition is attributed to the pride that follows prosperity. Part of the church had become jealous of the other part. The evil effects of jealousy are shown from numerous Old Testament examples. Jealousy lay at the root of the persecutions in which Peter, Paul, etc., suffered martyrdom. That there is room for repentance on the part of the offenders is shown from Old Testament examples. The Corin-

[illegible]

thians are exhorted to humility in view of the Messianic passage (Isa. 53), and of the example of many Old Testament heroes. God is long-suffering and will forgive the penitent. Yet he is a God of order. He keeps the universe in order. If the Corinthians would act worthily of such a God, they must do all things in order and peace.

General directions follow as to the respect due to presbyters. As a motive for guarding against sedition the Corinthians are reminded of the second coming of the Lord and of the resurrection. The resurrection is proved by the argument from analogy (day—night; seed—plant; the Phœnix, etc.).

God's blessing is to be found in faith, but not without works.

The Roman army, in which each member has a particular place allotted, and contributes to the completeness and strength of the whole, should be an example to the church. The Christian ministry is compared to the Levitical priesthood as regards order, etc. Christ was sent from God, the apostles from Christ. These appointed bishops and deacons, and indicated others to succeed, in case the first should die. Now the Corinthians have removed some holy men from service. The influence of one or two men of no consequence has led to the deposition of men appointed by the apostles. This has given an occasion to the enemies of the gospel to blaspheme the Lord's name. The seditious should confess their sins. Such confession is shown to be noble from Old Testament examples. They should be willing, in order to avoid strife, to retire to whatever place the church may wish. The authority of the presbyters should be respected, especially of such as were appointed by the apostles.

The Roman letter was manifestly based upon the *ex parte* statements of the aggrieved presbyters. It is very possible that the younger men, who had gained influence enough in the church to secure the removal of the old presbyters from office, would have been able in some measure to justify their successful efforts for a change in the administration. It is conceivable that the old presbyters had come to presume too much on their apostolic appointment, and were disposed to be arbitrary, or had become inefficient because of age.

d. Theology of the Epistle. Whatever of a theological nature occurs in the epistle is entirely practical and not speculative.

God is spoken of as the "great Creator and Lord of all," "the all holy Framer and Father of the ages"; "his energy pervades all the operations of nature"; his forbearance, mercy, and love are emphasized.

Christ is most commonly designated as "our Lord Jesus Christ." He is described as the reflection or radiance of God's greatness. He was "sent by God." "His blood was given for us." "On account of the love which he had unto us, Jesus Christ gave his own blood for us, and his flesh for our flesh, and his soul for our soul."

The nearest approach to a doctrine of the Trinity in Clement is in chap. 46: "Have we not one God, and one Christ, and one spirit of grace which was poured out upon us, and one calling in Christ?"

Salvation is represented as being in and through Christ, but is also connected with the fear of God and with love (chap. 48; 21:1; 22).

The idea of a church in this epistle is that of a well-ordered assemblage composed of members possessed of equal rights and privileges, all of whom are essential to each other as parts of the body to the body, but some of whom being more highly gifted, are to direct the less intelligent and less gifted (chap. 37). Only two classes of officers are recognized, bishops or presbyters and deacons. No class is recognized as having an inherent right to control the church; but the opinion is expressed that those who were appointed by an apostle, with the consent of the church, and who had performed their duties blamelessly, ought not to be deposed.

REMARK.—The so-called Second Epistle of Clement, now almost universally regarded as a fragment of a homily, was probably written not earlier than A. D. 130, and hence cannot well be the work of Clement, the third pastor of the Roman church. The Clementine "Recognitions" and "Homilies" ascribed to Clement of Rome, have been described sufficiently in the section on the Ebionites. These were probably written about a century after Clement's time. The "Epistles to Virgins" is a still later forgery, representing the full-fledged ascetical spirit of the third century. A number of other writings were set forth under the name of this author, as the "Letter to James," the "Dialogue of Peter and Apion," an address "To the Holy Spirit," etc.[1]

(2) *The Epistle of Barnabas.* after [illegible] 135 ad 11

LITERATURE: See in addition to authorities cited above, full bibliography in Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn, and in Lightfoot.

a. Authorship. The Epistle has often been ascribed to Barnabas, the fellow-laborer of Paul.

(*a*) The grounds in favor of this view are: The authority of Clement of Alexandria, who regarded it as an apostolical writing and wrote a commentary on it.[2] Origen also evidently regarded it as the work of the New Testament Barnabas. Eusebius mentions the epistle as bearing this name, but classes it, along with the "Acts of Paul," the "Pastor of Hermas," and the "Apocalypse of Peter," as a book that had been regarded by some as Scripture, but which was in his time rejected. This, however, is not necessarily against its having been written by the New Testament Barnabas. Jerome speaks of Barnabas, ordained by Paul, apostle of the Gentiles, as having composed an epistle pertaining to the edification of the church, which is read among apocryphal writings. It is found in the "*Codex Sinaiticus*" (one of the oldest biblical MSS.), under the caption "Epistle of Barnabas."

(*b*) The grounds against the view are mainly internal, as those in favor of it are external. They are: The unaccountable blunders which the author makes with regard to the Jewish ceremonial law. He describes ceremonies for which no authority can be found either in the Old Testament or the Talmud (chap. 7 and 8). Now 1. Barnabas, the companion of Paul, was a Levite, and cannot well be supposed to have been capable of such blunders. He lays stress on the Greek letters that repre- 2. sent the number of servants that Abraham circumcised as making up the name Jesus. The Levite Barnabas could hardly have forgotten that the Old Testament was writ- 3 ten in Hebrew. The absurd statements with regard to the habits of animals are a probable, though not decisive, ground against the theory that the epistle is the work of the New Testament Barnabas. The way in which the author looked upon Judaism, not as a preparation 4 for Christianity, but rather as a wicked externalizing of what God meant to be spiritual, is hardly apostolic. The extravagant degree to which the allegory is employed seems unsuitable to an apostle.

---

[1] For full information on the pseudo-Clementine literature, see Harnack, "*Gesch. d. Alt. Chr. Lit.*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 47, 214, 228, 518, 761, 777, 778; *Bd.* II., *passim*; and Uhlhorn's article in the Herzog-Hauck "*Real-Encyk.*," third ed., *Bd.* IV., *Seit.* 170, *seq.*

[2] Cl. Alex., "*Stromat.*," Bk. II., chap. 6, 7, 20; Bk. V., chap. 10, etc.

Thus the external testimony, which is not contemporaneous, is in conflict with internal evidence of the strongest kind.

b. Date. The epistle must have been written after the destruction of the temple (70), which is pre-supposed in it (16 : 3, 4 ; 4 : 14). It could not well have been written later than 137, when the Jewish insurrection led by Barcochab had resulted disastrously, and the restoration of the temple was out of the question. Hadrian had expressed at the beginning of his reign a purpose to rebuild the temple. Between these two dates a dozen different determinations have been made. It was probably written about 119, near the beginning of Hadrian's reign, and some time before the Jewish insurrection had broken out. Bunsen, on internal evidence, fixes the date during the Domitian persecution—hence 95 or earlier. Lightfoot assigns a still earlier date, the earliest possible, 70–79. Harnack thinks 130-131 the most probable date.

c. Abstract. The author salutes his readers as sons and daughters, assures them that he loves them more than his own life, and that on this account he hastens to write to them, in order that along with their faith they may have knowledge. Since the days are evil and Satan has authority, they ought to attend carefully to the decrees of God, their faith being aided by fear and patience.

God did not desire ceremonial service even under the Old Testament dispensation, much less now. The readers are exhorted not to be like those that heap up sins, saying the Testament is the Jews' and ours. It is ours only, for the Jews lost their part in it when Moses broke the tablets. One object of Christ's coming was that the sins of the Jews might be consummated (chap. 6). The real meaning of the Old Testament prophecies can be arrived at only by the *gnosis* (knowledge, spiritual insight), which gnosis the author proceeds to give, finding types of Christianity wherever he seeks them in the Old Testament.

He proves allegorically that Christians and not Jews are the true heirs of the covenant (chap. 15). Neither do the Jews celebrate the right Sabbath. The Lord rejected the new moons and the Sabbaths of the Jews. A day with the Lord is as a thousand years. The seventh thousand of years is therefore the true Sabbath, and as this commences with the eighth day, the day of the Lord's resurrection, we Christians celebrate it with gladness.

~~The Jews~~ also made a mistake with regard to the temple, supposing that a house made with hands, and not rather the hearts of believers, was the temple of God. The epistle concludes with a description of the way of light and the way of darkness, and an exhortation to the readers to walk in the one and avoid the other.

There has been much discussion since the discovery of the "*Didache*" ("Teaching of the Twelve Apostles"), as to the relationship of the passage in Barnabas on the two ways to the similar passage in the "*Didache*." The view that both writers drew the material from a common source, a document that must have been in general use at a very early date, seems best supported.

d. Theology of the Epistle. There is nothing particularly striking about the theology of the Epistle except its manner of viewing Judaism. The writer goes far on the road that led many in his age to Gnosticism.

The word *gnosis* (γνῶσις) he employs again and again in much the same sense as that given it among the Gnostics. His hostility to the Jews, while it does not, like that of the Gnostics, lead to a denial of the goodness and supremacy of Jehovah, escapes such denial only by the supposition that the Jews entirely misapprehended the revelation made to them, and were never properly the people of God.

Like the Gnostics, the author indulges without scruple in allegory.

We cannot avoid the supposition that the epistle was written by a man who had come under the influence of the Alexandrian philosophy, and probably of the earlier forms of Gnosticism as well.

2 (3) *The Epistles of Ignatius.* 107 - 115

LITERATURE: Text and ancient testimonials in Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn; Zahn, "*Ignatius von Antiochen*," 1873; Lightfoot, "*Ignatius*," 1885; Réville, in "*Rev. d. l'Histoire d. Religions*," three articles, 1890. Lightfoot's great work in 2 vols. (3 parts) contains all the pertinent materials extant in Greek, Syriac, etc., translations of the epistles and of other important documents, and elaborate critical discussion of all points involved. He is commonly supposed to have settled the Ignatian question in favor of the shorter Greek form. For an admirable summing up of the results of the investigations of Zahn, Lightfoot, and Réville, see article by Starbuck in "Andover Review," September, 1892. See also Bunsen, "*Die drei ächten und die vier unächten Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochen*"; Cureton, "The Ancient Syriac Versions of the Epistle St. Ignatius," edited with an English translation, and Harnack's review of Lightfoot, "Expositor," January, 1886. For Harnack's latest view, see his "*Gesch. d. Altchr. Lit.*"

A peculiar interest attaches to the so-called Ignatian Epistles, partly on account of their inherent importance, and partly on account of the great uncertainty as to the true text.

a. Forms of the Epistles. We have three distinct forms of the Ignatian Epistles, differing greatly as to number, length, and substance. (*a*) The *longer Greek* form, which contains twelve epistles. This form is now universally regarded as a gross fabrication, and is supposed to have been composed in the fourth, fifth, or sixth century. It is full of anachronisms, and was evidently designed as a support for the hierarchical church at the time of its composition. (*b*) The *shorter Greek* form, which embraces the seven epistles mentioned by Eusebius, addressed to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphians, Smyrnæans, and Polycarp. (*c*) The *Syriac version*, discovered among the MSS. from the Nitrian desert, in the British Museum, and published by Cureton in 1845. This recension contains only three epistles, viz: those to the Ephesians, the Romans, and Polycarp, and these in a very short form.

The shorter Greek form had long been strongly suspected, owing in part to the fact that the longer form was acknowledged to be spurious, in part to the fact that episcopacy seemed to have an emphasis given to it out of keeping with what was otherwise known of the church polity of the early part of the second century, and in part to the extravagances and lack of verisimilitude in the writings themselves. Cureton's discovery was at once regarded by himself and many other scholars as involving a simple solution of the whole problem. Cureton maintained that the three Syriac epistles, in which most of the objectionable features of the shorter Greek epistles are wanting, represent the original Epistles of Ignatius, and that on this basis had grown up the whole body of Ignatian documents. Bunsen lent the weight of his great name to this theory, and for a time it seemed likely to prevail. But the effect of the latest criticism by Zahn, Lightfoot, Réville, and others, has been to demolish the claims of the Syriac form to priority, and to establish the comparative originality of the shorter Greek form.

b. Authenticity. (*a*) *Internal Evidences.* As already intimated, Zahn and Lightfoot have, in the opinion of a large majority of competent judges, established the originality of the shorter Greek form of the epistles, as compared with any other form. If there are any genuine Ignatian epistles, these alone can claim to be such. That just seven epistles are mentioned by Eusebius, with identical addresses, is favorable to the claim. The considerations adduced have convinced many critics that these seven epistles were written by Ignatius, under the circumstances supposed. Some accept these writings as in the main genuine, but suppose them to have been interpolated to a very considerable extent. The fact that interpolation and forgery figure so prominently at a later time in connection with the Ignatian literature would suggest the possibility that the seven epistles may represent an earlier, more moderate, corruption in the interests of episcopacy and asceticism. Some (so Völter) reject the epistle to the Romans, while accepting the substantial genuineness of the other six epistles.

Harnack, Zahn, and Lightfoot have so completely mastered the pertinent literature, have so minutely considered every objection that has been raised or is likely to be raised, and have answered the objections with such plausibility, that skepticism as to the authenticity of the epistles would almost seem to be out of place. They have sought to show that greater difficulties by far are involved in the rejection than in the acceptance of the genuineness of the writings. A later writer, they claim, would inevitably have fallen into anachronisms, the existence of which in these documents is denied. They hold that there is nothing in the circumstances (the condemnation and transportation to Rome of a leading Christian, the freedom to meet deputations from the churches and to carry on an extensive correspondence during the journey, the implied supposition that the Christians of Rome might be able to secure a reversal of the death sentence) or in the extravagant desire for martyrdom that finds utterance in the epistle to the Romans, inconsistent with the supposition that they were written by Ignatius of Antioch in the time of Trajan.

We must admit the possibility of the supposed circumstances and of the supposed psychological states and consequent acts of Ignatius; but we may well be excused if we find ourselves unable to agree with these great scholars as to the probabilities of the case. The objection based upon the writer's strong episcopal tendencies has little weight (see below); but questions like the following thrust themselves upon us, and are not set aside by the plausible answers that have been given: Is it psychologically conceivable, or if so, is it within the bounds of probability, that a Christian man who had associated with apostles, and who by reason of his character and abilities had attained to a position of commanding influence throughout Syria and Asia Minor, could think, write, and act as Ignatius is represented as doing in these documents? Is it likely that a man condemned to a cruel death on the sole ground of his Christian profession and guarded night and day by ten Roman soldiers, should have been accorded the privilege of meeting with deputations from the churches on the route, and of writing such a body of letters as those before us? Is it reasonable to suppose that a man condemned by the emperor for being a Christian should imagine the Roman Christians possessed of such influence and such boldness as might lead them to secure his release? Trajan can scarcely be supposed to have been so capricious a ruler as to condemn the bishop of Antioch to death by wild beasts in the Roman arena on the ground of his faith and to pardon him at the request of his Roman fellow-Christians. Lightfoot attributes failure to be convinced of the conclusiveness of his answers to these and like questions to deficiency of "historic imagination." So much for the internal evidences of the genuineness of the seven epistles.

(*b*) *External Evidences*. The external evidences must next be briefly considered. First and most important is the testimony of Polycarp of Smyrna, to whom one of the Ignatian epistles is addressed. Admission of the genuineness of the epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians is thought to carry with it admission of the genuineness of the Ignatian epistles. Polycarp informs the Philippians that he is sending them "the letters of Ignatius which were sent by him to us together with any others which we had in our possession." If this passage is genuine, there must have been in circulation in Asia Minor, shortly after the supposed martyrdom of Ignatius, a considerable body of Ignatian epistles. Irenæus (175–190) quotes, as the utterance of a martyr, the Ignatian statement: "I am the wheat of God, and I am ground by the teeth of wild beasts, that I may be found pure bread." Other supposed slight indications of Ignatian influence have been pointed out. The sentence quoted might well have been handed down by tradition, or in some martyrology, as having been uttered by Ignatius or some other martyr. Lightfoot lays much stress on the points of similarity between the account of the condemnation, transportation, and martyrdom of Ignatius and Lucian's account of the death of Peregrinus Proteus, and maintains Lucian's indebtedness to the Ignatian epistles. This we must regard as extremely doubtful; for even if the interdependence of the two narratives could be proved, Lucian's may well have been the original. Origen (died 257) mentions Ignatius as suffering martyrdom at Rome, and quotes a sentence. Eusebius (fourth century) is the earliest writer to give any detailed account of the Ignatian literature. He mentions the epistles by name, and so characterizes them as to identify them to some extent with those under consideration. But Eusebius' notice does not exclude the possibility that the documents he knew were forged or interpolated, or that the documents we possess may have been interpolated since his time.

We conclude: First, that there probably was an Antiochian bishop in the time of Trajan named Ignatius; secondly, that he probably suffered martyrdom at Rome; thirdly, that he probably wrote some letters on his journey; fourthly, that what he wrote furnished the basis of the extant Ignatian documents; fifthly, to what extent interpolations have occurred it is impossible to determine.

c. General Tone of the Epistles. The tone of the epistles is excited and extravagant. This is especially the case with the epistle to the Romans. The style is rhetorical and somewhat artificial. There seems to be a straining after effect. They are taken up largely with exhortations to the churches addressed to steadfastness, unity, subjection to one another, to the presbyters, overseers, and deacons. The epistle to the Romans consists of a flattering salutation to the church (not to the bishop), of an account of his journey under guard of Roman soldiers, of rejoicing in his prospective martyrdom, and of an urgent request that the Roman Christians may do nothing that could rob him of the opportunity to suffer for Christ, intimating that this would be doing him the greatest possible injury. He is the "wheat of God," and wishes to be ground by the teeth of wild beasts, in order that he may "become the pure bread of Christ." Not as Peter and Paul does he instruct them. They were apostles, he is a condemned man. They were free, he is even until now a slave; but if he suffers he will become a freeman of Jesus Christ.

d. Date. The probable date of the martyrdom of Ignatius, and hence of the original Ignatian epistles, if there were such, is 107 or 115. Trajan was in Syria at each of these dates, and the persecution in which Ignatius suffered may have occurred on either occasion.

e. The Relation of the Epistles to Episcopacy. These epistles have formed the chief bulwark of the Romish church for its doctrine of episcopacy. In this interest the epistles have been interpolated beyond almost any other document of antiquity. But the very fact that they were laid hold of for this purpose is strong evidence that the original documents had at least something of the same tendency. Admitting that the seven Greek epistles mentioned by Eusebius are genuine (though it is highly propable that they are interpolated to a considerable extent), we may say: (*a*) That the very fact that in each letter Ignatius should have felt called upon to lay so much stress on the obedience due to bishops or overseers, is conclusive evidence that such subordination did not exist in the churches. We have, therefore, the writer's ideal rather than a record of historical fact. (*b*) There were undoubtedly at this time elements of discord in the churches addressed, resulting largely from the influence of heretical bodies. The churches were in danger of being rent asunder. Now, Ignatius looked upon schism as the greatest evil. He saw in obedience to the bishops a means of preserving unity. Hence the frequent exhortations to obey the bishops, and to do nothing without their approval. (*c*) There is no intimation that at this time the word "bishop" meant anything more than overseer or pastor of a single congregation, and the chairman of the Board of Elders. Presbyters are nowhere in the epistles exhorted to obey the bishops. (*d*) Ignatius wrote to churches whose bishops he knew to be holy men. He probably knew that these men were far superior in point of intelligence and Christian knowledge to the bulk of the church-members, such superiority in religious life and wisdom having been the ground on which bishops were chosen. Why should not Ignatius have exhorted the brethren to look upon such men as in the place of Christ? to regard them as representing the mind of Christ? (*e*) Side by side with these exhortations to obedience to bishops we must put such passages as these: "Be obedient to the presbyters" (Eph. 20); "Be subject to the presbytery as to the law of Jesus Christ" (Magnesians 2); "I pray that he (the deacon Burrus) may abide in the honor of you and of the bishop" (Eph. 2); "Reverence one another, and let no one look upon his neighbor according to the flesh," etc. (Eph. 6); "Be ye subject to the bishop and one to another" (Eph. 13); "Let all reverence the deacons as a commandment of Jesus Christ."

[illegible]

(4) *The Shepherd of Hermas.*

[illegible]

LITERATURE: Text, full bibliography, etc., in Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn; text, translation, and notes, in Lightfoot, "Apostolic Fathers"; Zahn, "*Der Hirt des Hermas*"; Lipsius, art. "Hermas," in Schenkel's "*Bibel-Lexikon*"; Bunsen, "Hippolytus and his Age," Vol. I., p. 182, *seq.*; Mossman, "History of the Early Christian Church," p. 294, *seq.*; Lightfoot, "Commentary on Galatians," p. 324, *seq.*; Sanday, "The Gospels in the Second Century," p. 273, *seq.*

This is probably the most remarkable production of the early church. Its position in the early church was somewhat analogous to that of "Pilgrim's Progress" in modern times. It was soon translated into Latin and Æthiopic. It was read in many churches, and was regarded as second only to the canonical Scriptures. In fact we find it in the *Codex Sinaiticus* in connection with the New Testament.

a. Form of the Writing. It is that of a religious allegory. The work consists of three parts: Visions, Commands, and Similitudes.

b. Date and Authority. It is now generally agreed, on the authority of the Muratorian Fragment, that it was written by Hermas, a brother of Pius, a pastor of the Roman Church, about 139–140. Its latest possible date is fixed by the absence of any indication of the agitation among Roman Christians, caused by the activity of Marcion. The false teaching referred to was probably that of the Gnostic Cerdo, possibly the earlier stages of the Valentinian propaganda. The author was, at an early date, confounded with the Hermas mentioned (Rom. 16:14) by Paul.

Irenæus, quoting from the book, begins: "Well then declared the Scripture, which says," etc.

The Muratorian Fragment (*c.* 200) denies its right to a place in the Canon, but implies that this dignity has been claimed for it by some.

Tertullian and the Montanists rejected it as a Christian manual for reasons to be given below.

Clement of Alexandria appeals to it again and again as an inspired book.

Origen thought that the author of the Shepherd of Hermas was the Hermas of Rom. 16 : 14, and it seemed to him divinely inspired.

Eusebius mentions it as spoken against by some, but by others judged most necessary for those who are in need of introductory grounding in the elements of the Christian faith.

Athanasius speaks of it as a most useful book, and quotes from it extensively.

Harnack defends the unity of the book against Ewald, Zahn, Caspari, and Hilgenfeld, but supposes that it grew slowly into its present form in the hands of the author, the germ having been the second Vision.

c. Contents. The supposed narrator represents himself as a slave sold by his master to a Roman lady named Rhoda. Having allowed himself to entertain an impure desire for a beautiful woman whom he chanced to see bathing in the river, and being penitent for his sin, a vision was vouchsafed to him in which the woman whom he had desired appeared to him, rebuked him severely for his fault, and gave him much wholesome advice regarding the Christian life. Later an older woman appears to him and freely answers all the questions regarding the Christian life that he feels inclined to ask. The five Visions are followed by twelve Commands, and these by ten Similitudes.

A detailed summary of the contents would require more space than can be spared. That the Christian life of the time, and especially in Rome, abounded in corruption is evident from the great variety of transgressors that are specifically rebuked. Among these may be mentioned informers and traitors; blasphemers, or those that yield to the demands of persecutors to curse Christ; renegades, or those that on account of cowardice, or to save their property, fled from persecution; hypocritical pretenders; libidinous people; teachers of iniquity, who have deserted the true way and disseminate false doctrines; friends of the heathen; those who are hampered by the world with its riches and pursuits; calumniators, contentious ones, schismatics; those who bear grudges; those who, though they have known the truth, withdraw from association with the saints; ambitious men eager for honor; insincere, lukewarm, and vacillating people; those who have submitted themselves to Christian teaching and yet refuse to be baptized; false prophets who, after the manner of the heathen, prophesy for gain, and followers of such; presidents (head-elders) who are unjust, contentious, vain, malicious, or negligent, and deacons who appropriate the goods entrusted to them. On the other hand, those who practised all manner of Christian virtues, and exemplified in their lives all Christian graces, are frequently referred to.[1]

d. Theology of the Shepherd. As regards the Godhead there is little that is peculiar in this writing, the views being in general accordant with the teachings of the New Testament.[2] The peculiarities of teaching appear:

(*a*) In the representation of the relation between baptism and regeneration. It is said: "Whoever with his whole heart changes his mind (or repents), and purifies himself from all iniquity, and adds no more to his sin, will receive from the Lord a cure for all his former sins." Again: "The elect of God will be saved through faith." Yet in Commandment 4 : 3, baptism is represented as having a very important relation to salvation: "We went down into the water and received remission from our former sins." Again, in Similitude 9 : 16: "Into the water, therefore, they descend dead and arise living." The writer's view, then, is evidently that baptism is the culminating act in the process of regeneration. Repentance and faith necessarily precede, but it is only in connection with the baptismal act that the remission of sins really occurs.

(*b*) In the view expressed as to the pardonableness of post-baptismal sins. In Commandment 4 Hermas represents the Shepherd as commanding that, if a man have a believing, adulterous wife, and she repent, he shall receive her back. If he "receive her not back, he sinneth a great sin; . . for there is *one* repentance to the servants of God." Again, Hermas says to the Shepherd: "I have heard from certain teachers that other repentance there is none, save when we went down into the water and received remission of our former sins." And the Shepherd answers: "Thou hast heard well, for so it is." "But I say unto thee, that if after that great and blessed calling, one tempted by the devil sin, he ha *one* repentance." It appears, therefore, that at the time of the writing of this book, there were already to be distinguished a strict and a lax party, the one denying the possibility of the forgiveness of post-baptismal sins, and the other erring in the opposite direction. Hermas attempts to mediate between the two, guarding against license on the one hand, and against excessive rigor on the other. It was this slight concession to laxity that led Tertullian, after he became a Montanist, to stigmatize this writing as licentious.

---

[1] See "Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn," *Fasc.* III., p. LXXIX.

[2] Conybeare ("The Key of Truth," p. LXXXIX.) finds in the Shepherd indications of Adoptionist Christology. This view seems to be supported by Similitude 5 : 5. But Hermas writes not polemically against a pneumatic Christology, but with primitive simplicity and without being aware that his statements involved a degradation of the Redeemer.

(*c*) There is a sentence in the Shepherd that has been understood to contains the germs of the doctrine of purgatory. In Vision 3 : 7, a completed tower, representing the one holy church, made of stones beautifully adjusted to each other, and which have passed through the water, having been shown to Hermas, he sees also other stones that have been cast aside and not fitted into the tower. He asks whether there is no repentance for these so that they may be fitted into the tower. The answer is: "That there is room for repentance, but not a chance for a place in this tower. But that another and much inferior place they shall fit into, and this when they have been tortured and have fulfilled the days of their sins," etc. It is quite possible, however, that the writer had in view the penal sufferings of the present life.

(*d*) The church is represented as presided over by presbyters, and no distinction is apparent between presbyters and bishops. The unity of the church is emphasized continually, and illustrated by such images as the tower made up of many stones deftly fitted to each other.

(*e*) The Shepherd was designed wholly for edification. There is no writing of this period that throws a tithe as much light on the Christian life and thought of the time as does this. Scarcely any class of evil-doers seems to have been absent from the writer's mind, and all receive their share of reproof and exhortation. The condition of Christian life here represented is far from pure.

(5) *The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians.*

LITERATURE: Texts, etc., as above; Donaldson, "History of Christian Literature and Doctrine," Vol. I., p. 154, *seq.*; Bunsen, "Hippolytus and His Age," Vol. I., p. 225, *seq.*; Lightfoot, "Ignatius"; Renan, "*Journal des Savants*," 1874; "Supernatural Religion," Vol. I., p. 274, *seq.*, second edition.

a. Authenticity. The authenticity of this document has been called in question, but without sufficient ground. Lightfoot has defended it most ably as one of the chief witnesses of the Ignatian epistles. A number of scholars who regard the passage about the Ignatian epistles as an interpolation, admit the substantial genuineness of the epistle. Polycarp is represented by Irenæus, who was with him much in his early and Polycarp's later life, as a disciple of the Apostle John, and of other apostles. Irenæus says that he "distinctly remembers how Polycarp used to describe his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words. And whatsoever things he had heard from them about the Lord, and about his miracles, and about his teachings, Polycarp, as having received them from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, would relate altogether in accordance with the Scriptures."

Polycarp is therefore one of the most important of the Christians of the second century. He learned from the apostles, lovingly treasured up in his memory, and frequently communicated to other, the things that he had learned. Irenæus appropriated these teachings in the spirit in which they had been repeated, and himself retained a vivid remembrance of them until his death, near the close of the second century. The fact that he was a man of no originality, as we see from the writing under consideration, makes it more probable that he did not modify the things he heard from John, etc., by his own individuality. He was for many years pastor of the church of Smyrna, and suffered martyrdom about 155 or 156.

It is probable that the epistle to the Philippians has suffered some corruption, but we are justified in regarding it as in the main genuine.[1]

b. Date of the Epistle. The manner in which the martyrdom and epistles of Ignatius are mentioned, if they are not interpolations, would lead us to fix the date of th epistle as shortly subsequent to the martyrdom of Ig natius, *i. e.*, about 108 or 116.

---

[1] There is a beautiful account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, which purports to be a letter written by the church of Smyrna to the church in Philomelium in Phrygia. It was certainly written not long after the event, as it is mentioned by Irenæus.

c. Character of the Epistle. The epistle shows scarcely any originality, but consists almost entirely of direct or indirect quotations from the Scriptures. From the early date to which it must be assigned, if its genuineness is acknowledged, it is especially important for the testimony that it furnishes to the still earlier date and use in the churches of most of the New Testament books. Especially does it show clearly by its numerous citations from the writings of Paul the futility of the efforts of the Tübingen school to establish the fact of an antagonism in the early church between the Pauline and Johannean theology. Imp

d. Theology of the Epistle. This is eminently scriptural, almost every doctrinal expression being in the words of the New Testament. Docetism is denounced, but in the words of John (1 John 4 : 3). The church is represented as administered by presbyters and deacons, and the duties of these are pointed out in New Testament language. It is remarkable that though Polycarp wrote after Ignatius, nothing of a hierarchical tendency occurs in his writing.

(6) *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*

70 and 160

LITERATURE: Editions of Bryennios, Harnack, Hilgenfeld, J. Rendel Harris, and Schaff. The last named (third edition, 1889) is the most complete. It contains *facsimile* of MS., text, and translation, full bibliography, illustrative documents, and discussion of all points involved. Harris' edition gives the entire text in *facsimile*, and contains valuable prolegomena and notes.

The writing entitled "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" was discovered a few years ago by Philotheos Bryennios, Metropolitan of Nicodemia, in the Jerusalem Monastery of Constantinople, and was edited by him in 1883. The MS. was written about 1056, and contains, besides the Teaching, Chrysostom's Synopsis of the Old and New Testaments, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Epistles of Clement of Rome (the only complete copy known), the spurious Epistle of Mary of Cassoboli to Ignatius, and the twelve Pseudo-Ignatian Epistles.

This "find" of Bryennios was hailed as one of the most important of modern times, and in a short time a library of books and articles had been published about it.

Much of the interest was due to the fact that the document was supposed to have originated near the close of the apostolic age. With many the chapter on baptism was the center of interest. Probably no other event of recent times has done so much to quicken popular interest in early Christian literature.

a. Date of Composition. The utmost diversity of opinion as to the date of the Teaching has existed since its publication. Most students have assigned dates within the period A. D. 70–165: Bryennios, 120–160; Harnack, 130–*c.* 160; Hilgenfeld, latter half of second century; Farrar, *c.* 100; Lightfoot, 80–110; Warfield, *c.* 100; Schaff, 70–100. The "archaic simplicity" of its practical directions and the apparent primitiveness of its church order are the chief grounds on which the claim of antiquity rests. The relation of the first chapters on the "two ways" to a similar section of the Epistle of Barnabas, has had much to do with the opinions of scholars. Those who hold that Barnabas borrowed from the Teaching incline to an early date for the latter; those who suppose the writer of the Teaching to have been indebted to Barnabas naturally give to the former a later date. The better opinion probably is, that both writers used an older widely circulated document. The primitiveness of the church order is not inconsistent with a much later date than the earliest assigned, if we suppose (which was probably the case) that it was prepared and first used not in a great ecclesiastical center, where hierarchical development made great strides during the latter part of the second century, but in some region remote from the great currents of church life. (Compare the simplicity and primitiveness of the Coptic and Ethiopic Apostolical Constitutions, which no doubt assumed their present form about the beginning of the fourth century.) There is therefore no reason for assigning the Teaching to an earlier date than the latter part of the second century.

b. Place of Composition. Here also opinions vary. Syria and Egypt have each its advocates. The weight of argument seems to be in favor of Egypt. Most of the early evidence of the use of the document is found in Egyptian writers. Its similarity to the Epistle of Barnabas, to the Egyptian Ecclesiastical Canons of the Holy

Apostles, and to the Apostolic Constitutions, favors this view. The circumstances supposed in the chapter on baptism seem to accord better with what we know of Egypt than with what we know of Syria. The mention of mountains in the eucharistic prayer (Chap. IX.) has been adduced in favor of Syria. In any case, the writing was prepared by a Jewish Christian for use in a Jewish Christian community.

c. Authenticity. It is doubtful whether the writer intended to represent the Teaching as composed by the twelve apostles. He may have meant only to claim for his compilation conformity with apostolic teaching. Few early Christian writings are so poorly attested. Eusebius (*c.* 325) mentions a writing called "Teachings of the Twelve Apostles" as being among spurious writings Athanasius (fourth century) mentions a writing under this name as proper reading for catechumens. There is no earlier mention of the Teaching. Clement of Alexandria (*c.* 202) quotes a sentence that is found in the Teaching; but both writers may have derived it from some earlier document. Little importance can be attached to slight coincidences in expression with passages in the Teaching found in other ante-Nicene writers. There is no certainty that the document we possess is identical with that mentioned by Eusebius and Athanasius, or that the latter was as ancient as the second century.

d. Sources of the Teaching. There are a few quotations from the Old Testament, and several allusions to Old Testament and apocryphal books. The New Testament books are not referred to by name, but most of the gospel precepts that are quoted are to be found in Matthew's Gospel. A few sentences correspond with passages in Luke's Gospel. Whether the writer had before him these two Gospels, or whether he had a combination Gospel, we cannot say. A number of coincidences have been pointed out that would seem to indicate some knowledge of Johannean teaching. There is no direct reference to Paul or his Epistles, though there are passages that may have been suggested by Pauline writings. Coincidences with other New Testament writings are scarcely definite enough to warrant the inference that the writer was acquainted with them. Schaff has made a detailed study of the seeming quotations from and allusions to the Old and New Testament writings, and has subjoined a tabulated view.

e. Relation of the Teaching to Other Documents. Whether the Teaching is an original work or a compilation it is not easy to decide. The latter is the more probable view. The material of the first six chapters, consisting of the "two ways," had great currency among the ancient churches. It is found in somewhat fuller form in the Epistle of Barnabas, and with still greater amplification in the Ecclesiastical Canons of the Holy Apostles, an Egyptian document (preserved in Greek, Coptic, and Ethiopic, probably written in the third century), and in the Apostolical Constitutions (fourth century), which purport to have been written by Clement of Rome. In the Ecclesiastical Canons the moral precepts are distributed among the apostles. It is not likely that the Teaching was derived from either of these documents, and it is by no means certain that either of these was derived from the Teaching.

f. Contents. The first six chapters consist of moral precepts, adapted to purposes of catechetical instruction. Chap. VII. gives directions as to baptism. Trine immersion, after catechetical instruction, fasting, and prayer, is prescribed. In case of absolute lack of any kind of water, affusion is allowed. Chap. VIII. gives directions for fasting and prayer, Wednesdays and Fridays being the days prescribed for fasting, and the prescribed form of prayer being the Lord's Prayer, to be used thrice each day. Chap. IX. gives directions, with forms of prayer, for the celebration of the eucharist. This ordinance is restricted to baptized believers. Chap. X. gives a form of prayer to follow communion. Chap. XI. to XIII. treat of apostles and prophets, their testing and treatment. The utmost caution is to be used in receiving strangers claiming to be apostles and prophets; but every true prophet is worthy of his food. Chap. XIV. treats of the Lord's Day as the time of the Christian sacrifice. According to Chap. XV., bishops and deacons are to be elected by the church, and are to be held in honor along with prophets and teachers. The book closes (Chap. XVI.) with an exhortation to watchfulness in view of the coming of the Lord.

150

(7) *Fragments.*

7 *a.* *Papias of Hierapolis*, a disciple of John, who suffered martyrdom about 155, collected much information about the apostolic age, and wrote an "Explanation of the Lord's Discourses." Fragments have been preserved by Irenæus and Eusebius. These are of value chiefly in relation to the New Testament Canon.

b. *The Epistle to Diognetus* is a beautiful exposition of the Christian faith by an unknown author, and may have been written about the middle of the second century.

c. To *Sixtus* (the sixth pastor of the Roman church, 119–128) is ascribed a remarkable collection of four hundred and thirty "Sentences" or aphorisms. There is much doubt, however, as to the authorship of these "Sentences."

d. Of the large body of New Testament Apocrypha and Christian Sibylline books that have been preserved, a considerable number, doubtless, fall within the age of the Apostolic Fathers.

III. THE APOLOGETICAL PERIOD.

LITERATURE: Otto, "*Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Sæculi Secundi.*" This edition contains critical texts of all the extant documents, together with full prolegomena, critical, exegetical, and historical notes, Latin translation, etc.; English translation in the "Ante-Nicene Fathers."

By the time of the Emperor Hadrian, Christianity had attained to considerable importance, and systematic efforts for the securing of its rights began to be made. It came to be felt that patient endurance might be carried to an extreme, that it was better to live and labor than to suffer martyrdom. The apologists are Quadratus, Aristides, Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Hermias, and Melito. Of Quadratus and Melito we have only fragments.

1. *General Observations.*

(1) The earlier Christian writers show little culture or intellectual power. Now we see men trained in the phi-

losophy of the time bringing to the defense of the gospel all of their ability and culture. Such men, contributed greatly toward making Christianity respectable, toward stimulating Christian thought, and toward calling the attention of the educated classes to Christianity.

(2) The apologies were written, not so much with a view to inducing those addressed to accept Christianity, as to secure for Christians the right to exist.

(3) The most important of these were addressed to emperors, viz: to Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. This fact is in favor of the view that the persecution of Christians was not mainly the result of imperial edicts, but of popular prejudice and hatred.

(4) The charges against which they defend Christianity are three: Atheism, licentiousness, and cannibalism.

a. *Atheism* has always been regarded by the populace as one of the greatest of enormities. The Christians incurred this charge by their rejection of the pagan gods, by their refusal to sacrifice, and by their disuse of images. Pagans could not understand how any one could really believe in a god without these accessories. The apologists refute this notion by setting forth clearly the Christian idea of God, as a Spirit to be worshiped only spiritually. They show that their worship of God is far more real than the idol worship; nay, that the gods of the pagans are, according to their own representations, weak and contemptible, given to all sorts of human passions.

b. The charge of *licentiousness* arose doubtless from the fact that Christians frequently met in secret places at night, and that they manifested great affection one for another. The pagans were unable to understand what other motive than licentiousness they could have for such meetings. The apologists in defense point out the Christian doctrine in regard to chastity, which makes even a licentious thought sin.

c. Whether the charge of *cannibalism* arose out of pure malice, or from a misunderstanding of the statements of Christians about eating the body and drinking the blood of Christ, it is impossible to determine. The apologists show that the Christian doctrine in regard to the deadly sin of murder is entirely antagonistic to the murdering of infants. Nay, Christians will not even allow the exposure of children (a thing common among the pagans). Besides, the Christian doctrine of the resurrection would prevent Christians from eating human flesh.

(5) They seek to show that Christianity is the oldest religion in the world, and not, as their enemies maintained, a thing of recent origin. Justin, *e. g.*, maintains that Moses wrote the Pentateuch long before the Trojan war, and hence farther back than the Greeks could trace their history. Christianity is simply a fulfillment of the prophecies and types of the Old Testament. It is maintained that all that is pure and noble in Greek literature was stolen from the Old Testament; that Socrates and Plato, *e. g.*, derived their ideas of God from Moses. The Sibyl is quoted as prophecy.

(6) The apologists stake everything on the Old Testament. Christ came to fulfill Old Testament prophecy, and to impress Old Testament teachings on men's minds, but he taught nothing new. To make these things appear, the allegorical method of interpretation is freely employed.

(7) The main evidence for Christianity, therefore, is prophecy. Miracles might be wrought by demons, but a prediction can come from God alone. Much effort is made to show definite fulfillment of prophecies.

(8) The purity of Christ's life and teachings, and the marvelous transforming power of Christianity are constantly and most impressively set forth.

2. *Individual Writers.*

The field now becomes so broad that we shall be obliged to examine it by specimens. We select Aristides as the earliest apologist whose writings are extant, and Justin as the ablest and most influential.

(*1*) *Aristides.*

LITERATURE: Harris and Robinson, "The Apology of Aristides," 1891; in Vol. IX., p. 257, *seq.*, of the "Ante-Nicene Fathers," New York, 1896, Kay has published translations of the Greek and Syriac texts in parallel columns, with introduction and notes; Egli, "*Zeitschrift f. Wissensch. Theol.*," *Seit.* 99, *seq.*; Hilgenfeld, *ibid.*, *Seit.* 103, *seq.*; MacDonald, "Indian Ev. **Rev.**," January, 1892, p. 279, *seq.*;

Harnack, in "*Theol. Litteraturzeitung*," 1891, *Seit.* 301, *seq.*, and 325 *seq.*, in Herzog-Hauck's "*Real-Encycklopadie*," second edition, *Bd.* XVII., *Seit.* 675, *seq.*, and in "*Gesch. d. Altchr. Lit.*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 96, *seq.*, *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 271, *seq.*; Seeberg, in "*Zahn's Forschungen*," *Bd.* V., *Seit.* 253, *seq.*, and 317; Hennecke, "*Texte und Untersuchungen*," *Bd.* IV., *Theil* 3.

a. Recovery of the Apology. Eusebius[1] mentions Aristides as "a believer earnestly devoted to our religion, who left an apology for the faith addressed to Hadrian." This document was until recently supposed to be irrecoverably lost. In 1878 a fragment, inscribed "Aristides, the Philosopher of Athens," was discovered and published by the Mechitarist monks of Venice, in an Armenian version. The materials available for forming a judgment as to its authenticity were insufficient, but most critics (Harnack included) pronounced in its favor. In 1889, Prof. J. Rendel Harris discovered a Syriac version in the convent of St. Catharine, on Mount Sinai, which he edited with prolegomena, translation, and notes, in 1891. Not long afterward Mr. J. A. Robinson, Harris' collaborator, discovered that the defense of Christianity contained in a religious novel by John of Damascus (died *c.* 754), entitled "Life of Barlaam and Josaphat," constituted the Greek text in a practically complete form. The Syriac text is far longer than the Greek as found in "Barlaam and Josaphat," and bears evidence of deliberate expansion. It is probable that the Greek text was somewhat condensed for insertion in the story. It is a remarkable fact that the main part of the Greek story in which the Apology of Aristides is embedded is taken from a Buddhist story entitled "Lalita Vistara," and that "Josaphat" is an adaptation of Gautama (Buddha) who figures in the original story. It is equally remarkable that the Roman Catholic Church long ago canonized the hero of the story as "St. Jehosaphat."

b. Date. According to the Syriac version the Apology was addressed not to Hadrian, as Eusebius supposed, but to Antoninus Pius. If the Syriac version is correct, the date of the writing could not have been earlier than 138, and it could not well have been written later than 147. Kay is inclined to credit Eusebius as against the

---

[1] "Church History," Bk. IV., Chap. III.

Syriac version, and to date the document about 125. In any case, it is probably the earliest extant post-apostolic defense of the Christian religion. The only known predecessor in this branch of literature is Quadratus, whose writing is lost.

c. Character of the Apology. It is largely occupied with an exposition of the Christian idea of God and of Christ, and of the Christian plan of salvation, by way of comparison with heathen religions. The author displays a remarkable acquaintance, not only with Greek and Roman philosophy and religion, but also with the Egyptian, Persian, and possibly with the Indian systems. The writer sets forth the characters of the heathen deities in a repulsive light, and the apology comes near being a polemic ; but the writing is conciliatory in spirit, and might have been expected to make a favorable impression on an emperor who had little regard for the current polytheism. No nobler defense of Christianity was ever written. It is possible that it had something to do with the comparatively favorable attitude of Antoninus toward Christians.

would

(2) *Justin Martyr.*

LITERATURE : See in addition to literature given above, Gildersleeve's excellent edition of "Justin's Apologies"; Semisch, "*Justin der Märtyr.*" (also English translation of same) ; Baur, "*Die drei erst. Jahrh.*," *passim ;* Ritschl, "*Altkath. Kirche,*" *passim ;* Bornemann, "*Das Taufsymbold. Justins Märtyr.*," in "*Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*," *Bd.* III., *Seit.* 1 ; Weizsäcker, "*Die Theol. d. Justin Märtyr.*," in "*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie,*" 1867, *Seit.* 60, *seq. ;* Aubé, "*S. Justin, Philos. et Martyr,*" 1875 ; Engelhardt, "*Das Christenthum Justins des Märtyr.*," 1878 ; encyclopedia articles on "Justin."

a. Sketch of Justin. The quasi-autobiographical details given in the dialogue with Trypho are generally taken to be substantially accurate. According to this account he was a Samaritan by birth, saw in his youth a good deal of persecution of Christians, and admired the endurance they displayed. He seems to have been possessed of ample means, and to have enjoyed excellent educational advantages. He studied for a while with a Stoic, hoping to find rest for his troubled soul. But finding himself growing none the wiser with regard to God, he went to a Peripatetic, a sharp fellow in his own eyes.

some

Soon disgusted with him, he betook himself to a celebrated Pythagorean, who insisted that he must learn music, astronomy, and geometry, as a necessary preparation for philosophical studies. Greatly troubled on account of this rebuff, he went to an intelligent Platonist, from whom he learned the Platonic philosophy, and for a time he was highly elated with his progress.

About this time, while walking near the seashore, he fell in with an aged Christian, with whom he conversed freely, and by whom he was convinced of the truth of Christianity. After his conversion we know very little of Justin's life. He continued to wear his philosopher's robe, while as an evangelist he traveled from place to place, seeking to win men to the gospel. He seems frequently to have sought conferences with men of education, and to have tried to convince them of the truth of Christianity. He met with violent opposition from the philosophers about the court of Marcus Aurelius, and his martyrdom (*c.* 165) was probably due to their animosity.

b. First Apology of Justin. This was addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius and his adopted son, Marcus Aurelius. The writer gives the time that has elapsed since the birth of the Christ as one hundred and fifty years.[1] Other internal and external evidences are favorable to this date (150), or a few years later. The year 138 or 139, that has sometimes been insisted upon, seems impossible, for Marcus Aurelius addressed as a "philosopher," was still a youth, and Lucius (Commodus?), also addressed as son of a Cæsar, was only eight or nine years old. It is written with care, and the emperor is addressed most courteously. The Apology is naturally divided into three parts. In part first he shows that Christians ought not to be condemned without a fair hearing, and that they are innocent of all crime. In part second he gives the arguments for the truth of the Christian religion. In part third he describes the worship of the Christians.

Part I. After the address, Justin claims for Christians the privilege of all defendants. It is unjust and demoniacal to condemn Christians unheard for the mere name's sake. Christians are no atheists. They worship God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. If some Christians are convicted of crime, let them suffer as individuals. But the fact that Christians prefer death to falsehood proves their innocence. Christians are not to be blamed for refusing to worship images—an absurd worship—nor for believing that God, the Creator of all things, does not desire gifts. Again, the empire has nothing to fear from Christianity; Christ's kingdom is not of this world. The empire has no better subjects than the Christians.

---

[1] "First Apology," Chap. 46.

Justin then points to the wonderful changes in the character of men wrought by Christianity; the strict observance of chastity, of love for all, of charity to the poor, of patience, of avoidance of swearing, of obedience to rulers, and of payment of tribute. If such subjects are to be despised, the emperors are in danger of future judgment. A resurrection of the body, which such judgment involves, is no more difficult for God than creation, and there is not half so much absurdity about the mysteries of Christianity as about those of paganism.

Part II. Justin undertakes to prove three things: (1) That truth is taught by Christianity alone; (2) that the Son of God was truly incarnate; (3) that the fables of paganism were invented by demons to discredit the advent of Christ, and make that appear a fable likewise The incarnation of Christ is proved from prophecy, and Justin lays down rules for the interpretation of prophecy Notwithstanding the fact that Christ's death and sufferings were predicted, man's will is free. Those that went astray before the incarnation of the Logos are responsible, for the seeds of the Logos were in all (Chap. 46). The fables concerning Zeus were invented by demons, with a view to throwing discredit on the coming of the Son of God. That Christ was to come they had learned from the prophets; but the demons did not understand, and hence were not able to imitate, the cross. Justin enumerates many symbols of the cross (Chap. 55). The demons still mislead men in the persons of such magicians as Simon, Menander, and Marcion, and cause the persecution of the Christians.

Part III. Justin here shows how the Christians consecrate themselves to God in baptism, celebrate the Lord's Supper, etc.

c. The Dialogue with Trypho the Jew. This production has the form of a Socratic dialogue, extending through some days, between Justin and Trypho with his six companions. The dialogue may be divided into three parts. First: Justin refutes the opinion of the Jews concerning the law. Secondly: He shows that the true Son was begotten by God, became incarnate, and was crucified for our sake. Thirdly: He maintains that the calling of the Gentiles and the constitution of the church by Christ were predicted and prefigured long ago. This extended writing is of great importance as showing the attitude of Jews and Christians toward each other about the middle of the second century.

d. Theology of Justin. (*a*) God the Father Justin seems to have regarded, with almost Gnostic absolutism, as absent in relation to creation and Providence. "He remains in the super-celestial regions—never appears or speaks to any one by means of himself."[1] "No one that has but a small particle of sense would dare to say that the Father, leaving all things above heaven, had appeared in a little portion of the earth."[2] Thus, the omnipresence of God seems to have been lost sight of.

(*b*) *Christ,* with Justin, is the Son of God. "As a beginning before all creatures, God begat a certain rational power from himself, who is also called by the Holy Spirit 'Glory of the Lord,' and sometimes 'Wisdom,' and sometimes 'God,' and sometimes 'Lord,' and 'Logos.'"[3] Through Christ all things were made, and through him all things are ordered. Justin makes no distinction between the divine and the human in Christ.

(*c*) *The Holy Spirit.* According to Justin, the chief work of the Holy Spirit was the inspiration of the prophets.

(*d*) *The Will.* Justin's doctrine of free will would probably have been regarded at a later time as Pelagian. The freedom of the human will is not affected by prophecy, for prophecy is simply a result of God's foreknowledge of what would be.[4] Every man has the power of choosing good or evil. Repentance or change of mind is an act of man's free will, by which he turns from evil to good. When a man changes his mind toward God, God at once pardons all his sins.[1] Christ's work in regard to man's salvation was, therefore, not to satisfy the Divine justice, but by enlightening men's minds to turn them from the worship of demons unto God, and as a sufferer, to go through all the trials of men, overcome them, and lead men to the same victory.

---

[1] "Dial. with Tr.," Chap. 56. [2] "Dial.," Chap. 60. [3] "Dial.," Chap. 61. [4] "First Apology," Chap. 64.

(*e*) *The Church*, as represented by Justin, consists of believers only. All the members are priests, and the sacrifices that these priests make are thanksgivings poured out over the cup and bread. The only officers mentioned are deacons and presidents. Baptism is administered only to believers, after fasting and prayer. Like Barnabas and Hermas, Justin seems to have regarded baptism as the culmination of the process of regeneration, in which remission of sins actually takes place. Christians meet together every Sunday. Some one reads as long as there is time from the writings of the apostles or prophets. Then the president instructs or exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then all rise together and pray. After this, bread and wine mixed with water are brought. The president gives thanks, the people saying 'Amen.' Then there is a distribution to each member present, and a part is sent to the sick. A collection for the poor follows. Justin gives us the most detailed and lifelike view of the ordinances and worship of the early Christians that we have.

The so-called "Second Apology" of Justin has been proved by Boll, Zahn, Harnack, Veit, *et al.*, to be no independent work, but a sort of appendix to the Apology proper. Justin had already written a somewhat elaborate "Syntagma," against the Gnostic heresies, which has perished, but the substance of which was probably incorporated in the works of Irenæus and Hippolytus.

(3) *Other Apologists.*

a. Tatian. The Apology of Tatian, or Oration to the Greeks (*c.* 172), is one of the most remarkable, though not one of the most important, of the apologies. Tatian was brought up in heathenism, was a sophist or rhetorician, and was therefore skilled in argumentation.

---

[1] "Dial.," Chap. 45.

His Apology is one of the most *denunciatory* of all the apologies of this time. In fact, it is little more than a tirade against paganism. Every pagan practice and belief is held up to ridicule with great acuteness and almost unrivaled sarcasm. The effect of such a writing could hardly have been favorable to the Christians. His classical references and quotations are more numerous than those of any early Christian writer except Clement of Alexandria. After the martyrdom of Justin, who seems to have helpfully influenced him, he adopted Gnostic views, repudiating marriage as sinful, rejecting the Old Testament as the revelation not of the true God, but of the Demiurge, etc.

b. Athenagoras. Next to Justin Martyr may be ranked Athenagoras, the Athenian philosopher, who embraced Christianity as a result of an examination of the Scriptures, with a view to their refutation, and who wrote an apology for the Christians to Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus (*c.* 177). The Apology is written in a rhetorical style, abounds in quotations from the Greek classics, and is exceedingly conciliatory in tone, verging upon flattery. The arguments employed and the character of the theology are not very different from those of Justin. In some respects this is one of the best and most admirable of all the Christian apologies of this age.

c. Theophilus. The next in importance, perhaps, is Theophilus of Antioch. Theophilus is said to have become bishop of Antioch about the eighth year of Marcus Aurelius, *i. e.*, 169, and wrote his treatise in defense of Christianity to Autolycus during the reign of Commodus, probably *c.* 190. Unlike the apologies of Justin and Athenagoras, the *main* object is, not to defend the Christians (though this is not neglected), but rather to convince Autolycus of the absurdity of heathenism and the truth of Christianity. Theophilus, like Athenagoras, shows great familiarity with Greek classics, and his writings are frequently resorted to by critics of the classical Greek texts on account of their richness in citations.

IV. THE POLEMICAL PERIOD.

There were polemical treatises in the preceding period. Justin, *e. g.*, wrote extensively against heresies, but nothing distinctively polemical has reached us from this period. Side by side, during the first half of the second century, an apologetical and a heretical literature had sprung up. In some of the Apologists, as in some of the Apostolic Fathers, we see tendencies that might easily develop into Gnosticism. Gnostics, about the middle of the second century, were everywhere attracting by their culture, their respectability, their extravagant claims to be the only true Christians, and by their aristocratical principles, many of the ablest minds. Many that did not fully accept their views were yet deeply affected by them. A *desire for system* was one of the fundamental characteristics of Gnosticism. This desire became contagious. The Gnostics' bold speculations with regard to the Godhead, the origin of the world, of sin, etc., were the means of arousing those who would otherwise have been content with simple faith to a systematizing of Christian doctrine. They felt that it was not enough to declare the Gnostic systems absurd. They must put something better in place of these. Christian writers now begin to express themselves accurately on doctrinal points.

1. *General Observations.*

(1) In the preceding period, the chief writers were men who had just emerged from heathenism, and had devoted their early manhood to heathen philosophy. They brought into Christianity much of their previous modes of thought, and hence we find a great deal of crudeness in some of their doctrinal statements. Now we find men that have grown up under the greatly improved Christian culture that prevailed after the middle of the second century.

(2) The Apologists wrote in times of persecution and aimed to ward off danger from without. The polemical writers see the greatest dangers to Christianity, not in outward violence, but in the alarming spread of error under the guise of Christian truth.

(3) Now for the first time the New Testament Scriptures are seen to occupy their proper place. The Old Testament is not discarded, but the New Testament books are quoted as authority and carefully studied. In their

contests with paganism, when the great reproach to be avoided was that of *novelty*, we have seen that the Christian Apologists attempted to prove Christianity to be the oldest religion in the world, and to this end exalted the Old Testament as the only source of authority. The case is different now. The polemical writings are mostly directed against Gnostic teachers, who entirely repudiated the Old Testament and sought to connect their systems with the New Testament writings.

(4) Here we first see the idea of an orthodox catholic church, strongly set forth in opposition to heresy, and the basis for future ecclesiastical development firmly laid.

(5) Most of the earlier writers had been Oriental by birth or by education. The ablest of the polemical writers belong to the West.

(6) Some writers of this period recognize, from seeing it carried to extremes by the Gnostics, the evil results of the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, without, however, being able entirely to free themselves from it.

(7) The method of argumentation most in favor is that of the *reductio ad absurdum*. Arguments from Scripture, especially from the New Testament, occupy, however, an important place.

2 *Individual Writers.*

(*1*) *Irenæus.*

LITERATURE: Harvey's and Stieren's editions (the former has English prolegomena and notes, and is the *best* edition; the latter has Latin prolegomena and notes, and embraces reprints of all the principal treatises on Irenæus from Erasmus onward); English translation in "Ante-Nicene Fathers"; Neander, Vol. I., *passim;* Pressensé, "Martyrs and Apologists," *passim;* Schaff, Vol. II., p. 746, *seq.;* Mœller, p. 199, *seq.;* Bunsen, "Hippol.," Vol. I., p. 246; Dorner, "Person of Christ," Div. I., Vol. I., p. 303, *seq.;* Ritschl, "*Altkath. Kirche*," p. 312, *seq.;* Duncker, "*D. Christologie d h. Irenæus;* Harnack, "*Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.*," 1874, p. 174, *seq.*, and p. 211, *seq.;* Zahn, "*Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.*," 1875, p. 72, *seq.;* Lightfoot, "Contemporary Review," August, 1896; Ropes, in "*Bibliotheca Sacra*," 1877; encyclopedia articles on "Irenæus."

a. Sketch. Irenæus was born in Asia Minor, about 130–135, and in his youth was a disciple of the aged Polycarp. He received a liberal education, for he cites most of the leading Greek classics. He was a diligent student of the Old and New Testaments. He quotes by name almost all the earlier Christian writers of whom we know anything. He was thoroughly acquainted with the heretical literature of his own and preceding times. He was, moreover, a man of great piety and zeal, and of simple faith. In 177, when Pothinus, the pastor of the Christian church at Lyons, had suffered martyrdom, Irenæus, who had been laboring in the region for some years as a missionary, bravely took the dangerous position. Persecution ceased, but the relaxation caused by immunity from persecution probably caused false doctrine to gain more and more acceptance. Toward the close of his busy life Irenæus wrote his "Five Books against Heresies" (*c.* 185), in which the views of the different heretical sects are stated and refuted, and in which Christian doctrine is ably expounded. The systematizing of Irenæus has formed the basis for all later efforts.

b. Abstract of the Five Books Against Heresies. Book I. is devoted mainly to a historical account of the various Gnostic sects (Chap. 1–9). By way of contrast to the heretical teachings, the author presents a declaration of the faith of the Catholic Church, perhaps the first distinct statement of the faith formally drawn up in a series of propositions.

Book II. is a philosophical polemic against the Valentinian Gnostics, interspersed with criticisms of their false interpretations of Scripture. The philosophical arguments are designed: (*a*) To prove the unity of God, and the absurdity of the Gnostic distinction between the Supreme Being and the Demiurge; (*b*) to overthrow the Platonic hypothesis of a correspondence between the world of ideas and the visible world. Many Valentinian doctrines rested on this. Irenæus insists that when the Scriptures are plain and unambiguous they shall not be explained ambiguously according to the fancy of the interpreter. The truth is never to be arrived at in this way, for the method of discovery has been rejected. Ambiguous passages (as parables) should not be made the source of doctrines (Chap. 1). Perfect knowledge is not attained in this life.

Book III. is chiefly a refutation from Scripture of the Gnostic heresies: First, concerning the unity of God, and secondly, concerning the person of Christ. The fact that the Gnostics differ among themselves, and the recent nature of their traditions, is contrasted with the agreement of Catholics in doctrine, handed down directly from the apostles. The Old Testament and the New Testament agree in teaching that there is but one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Creator of all things. Irenæus asserts the canonicity and inspiration of the four Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John), and of these only. He refutes the opinion of those who attempt to establish an antagonism between Paul and the other apostles by Paul's own testimony, that the same God wrought in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision and in himself to that of the Gentiles. He proves the pre-existence, incarnation, and suffering of Christ from Old and New Testament passages, rejecting, like Justin, the translation of the Hebrew word in Isa. 7:14, "young woman," and applying the prophecy to the birth of Christ from a virgin.

Book IV. consists of proof from the words of Christ himself that he recognized but one God and Father, and this the same that is set forth in the Old Testament. The Gnostics' perversions of the words of Christ are refuted. Irenæus proceeds to combat the view of Marcion, which excluded Abraham and his posterity from salvation through Christ, showing that they were inspired by the same God from whom Christ came (Chap. 8–11). The Old Testament system still continues in the New Testament system. Sacrifices are perpetuated in the Lord's Supper (Chap. 17, 18). The book concludes with a vindication of the Old Testament Scriptures against the cavils of the Gnostics.

Book V. is devoted chiefly to a vindication of the doctrine of the resurrection against the Gnostic objections. The chief objection of the Gnostics was the essentially evil nature of matter, and hence the unsuitableness of a material body for a state of blessedness. This same feeling led them to deny the real incarnation of Christ. Irenæus maintains the true humanity and the true divinity of Christ, and shows how both are necessary to the truth of our Lord himself and to the redemption of mankind. This established, he uses it as a proof against those who deny that flesh is capable of salvation.

c. *Theology of Irenæus*. (*a*) *God*. Irenæus does not, like Justin, exalt the Supreme Being above all relations to the world. The result of such exaltation in the Gnostic systems that he combats, depriving them as it did of any firm basis of thought and plunging them into endless speculations, would save him from such an error.

God co

(*b*) *The Son*. The emanation theory of the Gnostics would have prevented Irenæus from representing the Son as created or as emanating from the Father. With Irenæus the Logos is eternal. He says: "God being all mind and all Logos, both speaks exactly what he thinks and thinks exactly what he speaks. For his thought is Logos, and Logos is mind, and mind, comprehending all things, is the Father." Thus he seems to identify the Logos with the Father. Elsewhere he writes: "If any man say to us, 'How then was the Son produced by the Father?' we reply that no one understands that production, or generation, or calling, or revelation, or by whatever name one may describe his generation, which, in fact, is indescribable."[1] Perhaps his doctrine of the Logos can be fairly said to imply no more than that the Logos is God, considered in his thinking, creative, and redeeming aspect.

(*c*) *The Holy Spirit*, according to Irenæus, is identical with the Wisdom of the Old Testament, and is God manifest in Providence, revelation, and the human conscience. The Trinity of Irenæus would therefore be: God in the world, God in Christ, and God in himself.

(*d*) *Freedom of the Will*. In opposition to the fatalism of the Gnostics, Irenæus maintains the freedom of the will, and asserts that with God there is no coercion. Those who yield obedience to God have the promise of eternal good. Only by regarding the will as free can he account for the exhortations in the Old and New Testaments to do good, and the promises made to those that obey.[2]

(*e*) The eternal decree of *redemption* is represented as an act of God's love. The *atonement* is a ransom paid, not to God, but to the devil, to whom all who have disobeyed God are in subjection.

---

[1] Book II., Chap. 18.

[2] Book IV., Chap. 37.

(*f*) Irenæus looked upon the *Church* as an organic unity whose doctrine had been handed down through a succession of presbyters. He nowhere lays stress upon episcopacy as a divine institution, but makes the liberty and independence of each church (including a city with its surrounding villages) the fundamental principle of the ecclesiastical constitution. In Irenæus' time, the question whether Easter should be celebrated on the 15th Nisan on whatever day of the week it might occur, or on the first Sunday after the vernal full moon, was raging. Victor, pastor of the Roman church, was arrogant enough to break off communion with the churches of Asia Minor because they adhered to the former view. Irenæus, in an epistle to him (cited by Eusebius), while agreeing with him in opinion, censures severely his intolerant conduct. "Christ's apostles," he says, "have ordained that no one shall disturb men's consciences with regard to such things. It is not right to tear asunder the bonds of Christian communion on account of festivals and seasons, knowing as we do from the prophets that such things celebrated in hatred and discord do not please God."

We see also that the Roman church had by this time great prestige. Irenæus believed that it was established by Peter and Paul, who appointed successors. This belief, together with the position of the Roman church in the metropolis, the administrative ability that it early displayed, and the readiness with which it sent contributions to needy Christians in other places, caused it to be looked up to, and to be frequently appealed to in matters of controversy (so even in the time of Clement). We see also that a formalizing tendency had already set in at Rome and in Asia Minor (the Easter controversy); but Irenæus did not favor such a tendency.

(2) *Hippolytus.*

LITERATURE: De Lagarde's editions; English translation in the "Ante-Nicene Library"; Bunsen, "Hippolytus and his Age," 1852–6; Döllinger, "*Hippolytus u. Callistus*," 1853 (English translation, 1875); Wordsworth, "St. Hippolytus and the Church of

Rome"; Volkmar, "*Hippolytus u. d. röm. Zeitgenossen*," 1855; Lipsius, "*Quellen d. ältest. Ketzergeschichte*," 1875; Achelis, "*Hippolytstudien*," 1897; Caspari, "*Quellen zur Gesch. d. Taufsymbols*," *Bd.* III., *Seit.* 377, *seq.*, 1875. A new edition of the works of Hippolytus, edited by Bonwetsch and Achelis, is in process of publication under the auspices of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences.

a. Sketch. Considering the number and the importance of his writings, surprisingly little is known of the life of Hippolytus. Eusebius seems to be the earliest extant writer to mention him, and his knowledge was exceedingly limited. He was born, it is probable, shortly after the middle of the second century, whether in Rome or in the East is unknown. Like most of the leading Roman Christians of the second century he was of Oriental origin and Greek was his native tongue. He is said to have been a disciple of Irenæus, but when or where the personal intercourse of the two occurred is not recorded. It is not improbable that Irenæus on one of his visits to Rome gave a series of discourses on the Gnostic heresies that formed the basis of his great work on the subject. Eusebius calls him "bishop," but does not know over what church he presided. He places him in the time of Alexander Severus (222–235). From the "Refutation of All Heresies" it is manifest that Hippolytus was an active participant in Roman church matters during the pastorates of Zephyrinus and Callistus (199–222). It would seem that, for reasons given in another paragraph, he refused to recognize Callistus as bishop, and that he became the recognized leader or bishop of the stricter party that claimed to be the true church of Rome. After the death of Callistus he probably became reconciled with the principal church, and as a presbyter of the church continued his ecclesiastical and literary work until 235, when he and Bishop Pontianus were transported to Sardinia by Maximinus the Thracian. They probably died in the mines, but they are said to have been buried on the same day in Rome, where they were honored as martyrs. A statue of Hippolytus has been unearthed in modern times (1551), bearing a catalogue of his writings on its pedestal. The late tradition that he was bishop of the Portus (at the mouth of the Tiber) seems to be due to a desire to account for the fact that he was bishop and martyr by those ignorant of the fact that he was bishop of the faction that opposed Callistus.

Hippolytus was one of the four greatest scholars and theologians of his age (ranking with Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen), was a most rigorous disciplinarian, a keen and hard-hitting polemicist, and had much in common with contemporary Montanism and later Novatianism.

b. *Writings*. Hippolytus was a voluminous writer. The list of his works includes dogmatic, polemical, and exegetical treatises. Most of these have been preserved only in fragments. In 1842 a manuscript was discovered in the monastery on Mt. Athos, which was at first supposed to be the lost "*Philosophumena*" of Origen, and was published as such by E. Miller at Oxford in 1851. The criticism of Bunsen, Döllinger, Volkmar, *et al.*, proved that it was the "Refutation of All Heresies," by Hippolytus. The decisive considerations in favor of this view are, (*a*) that the style of the work is such as to exclude Origen's authorship, and (*b*) that the author refers to a work of his own whose title is given in the list of Hippolytus' works on the ancient statue referred to.

"The Refutation" covers substantially the same ground as the great work of Irenæus, which in many points it materially supplements. It is the opinion of many recent critics (Lipsius, Hilgenfeld, Harnack, *et al.*), that both writers drew largely from Justin's lost "*Syntagma*," that Hippolytus used the work of Irenæus, and that he had access to a number of Gnostic works that have perished. The most remarkable part of "The Refutation," and that which has been most provocative of controversy, is Book IX., in which he makes his refutation of the heresy of Noëtus an occasion for denouncing the laxity and doctrinal unsoundness of Callistus.

c. *The Roman Church in the Time of Hippolytus*. During the second century the Roman church greatly increased in numbers and influence. Persecutions had occurred from time to time, but these were not so severe nor continuous as seriously to interfere with the development of the body. No doubt it continued to receive important reinforcements from Asia Minor, Greece, Syria, and Egypt, and Greek appears to have been still the language of Roman Christians. With the exception of Minucius Felix, all Roman Christian writings till some time after the close of the second century were Greek. Gnosticism, Montanism, Adoptionism, and Monarchianism had found their way to Rome, and several leading Gnostic teachers had propagated their views there with considerable success. But the Roman church, so far from yielding to such influences, was led thereby to strengthen its organization. Monarchial episcopacy was one of the results of its contest with pagan intolerance and Gnostic heresy. From the beginning the Roman church manifested something of the practical spirit that little by little secured for it a place of leadership and authority among the churches. Its location in the great metropolis, its practical benevolence, its freedom from extreme doctrinal developments, due in part to its poverty in speculative theologians, gave it a great advantage over other churches. During the reign of Commodus and his immediate successors (180 onward) immunity from persecution had brought into the church multitudes of imperfectly Christianized people from the wealthier classes, and discipline was in consequence gradually relaxed. In the time of Hippolytus we see in the church two distinct parties, a rigorous party almost Montanistic in its severity, led by himself and apparently in a small minority, and a liberal party represented by Zephyrinus and Callistus, supported by the wealth and the social influence of the church.

Victor, chief pastor of the church (*c.* 189–199), had been a man of great sternness, and many had been restive under his rigorous discipline. He was succeeded by Zephyrinus (199–219), a man of little moral or intellectual weight, who permitted the flock to be led astray by all sorts of false teachers; and, under the influence of Callistus, permitted various moral delinquencies to have place in the church. Callistus, a slave, had been entrusted with a large sum of money, had embezzled it, had been imprisoned, then released, then banished to the mines of Sardinia for having caused a riot in a Jewish synagogue. Having escaped from the mines through the good offices of Marcia, the emperor's favorite, he returned to Rome, now a freed man, became the right-hand man of Zephyrinus, and succeeded him as chief pastor in 219.

During Zephyrinus' pastorate the Noëtian heresy, according to which God the Father and Christ are absolutely identical, and hence the Father was born of a woman and suffered on the cross, had been introduced at Rome. Callistus, apparently, adopted this doctrine, and brought his influence to bear upon the young and promising Sabellius. Hippolytus and his party strove earnestly against these theological errors, and were stigmatized by their opponents as *ditheists*, because they insisted on the absolute deity of Christ and yet refused to identify him with the Father. Hippolytus remonstrated with Sabellius, who held that the terms "Father," "Son," and "Spirit," are only designations of the three different phases under which the Divine essence reveals itself, all three together exhausting the revelation of God to the world.

Callistus, when he became chief pastor, threw off Sabellius as not orthodox, and with a view to conciliating Hippolytus and his party set forth his own views in a form slightly differing from the Noëtian, but in the opinion of Hippolytus essentially the same. This modified Sabellianism Callistus is said to have propagated with the greatest diligence and success. Callistus offended Hippolytus more by his laxity of discipline than by his doctrinal unsoundness. Many that had been excluded from the church for gross misconduct were restored, Callistus proclaiming himself ready "to forgive all sins." He taught that if a bishop should be guilty even of a mortal sin he could not be deposed. He maintained that Noah's ark, in which clean and unclean beasts were preserved together, was a type of the church. He is said to have permitted ladies of rank who did not wish to marry to have slaves for paramours.

In narrating the career of Callistus, Hippolytus manifests so much passion that his representations cannot be implicitly trusted. Callistus must have been a man of marked ability and more than usually attractive personality to have risen from slavery and a reputation for dishonesty to the foremost position in the church. He may have honestly differed from Hippolytus as regards the disciplinary policy of the church. Hippolytus imputes the worst of motives to all his actions, and represents his proceedings in the worst possible light. Rumors and suspicions figure, apparently, as undoubted facts.

It is by no means certain that Callistus was as much at fault in relation to Noëtus and Sabellius as Hippolytus would have us believe. The views of these teachers he caricatures. No doubt they were making an honest effort to express the great facts of revelation with reference to the Godhead in such a manner as to avoid ditheism or tritheism, the Gnostic emanation theory, and the Ebionitic denial of the true deity of the Son. They wished to hold fast the divine unity and monarchy and the absolute deity of Christ. The modal doctrine of the Trinity was the result. Sabellius applied the term "person" (πρόσωπον) to each of the three modes of divine manifestation (as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit), a term that in a different sense was to figure prominently in the orthodox theology of the later time.

(3) *Tertullian.*

LITERATURE: Oehler's edition of Tertullian; English translation in "Ante-Nicene Fathers"; Neander, "*Antignosticus*, Spirit of Tertullian," and "Ch. History," Vol. I., *passim;* Pressensé, "Martyrs and Apologists," p. 374, *seq.;* Schaff, Vol. II., p. 818, *seq.;* Kaye (Bishop of Bristol), "Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, Illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian"; Baur and Ritschl, as on "Montanism"; Bonwetsch, "*Die Schriften d. Tert. nach d. Zeit ihrer Verfassung*," 1879; Harnack, "*Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.*," 1878, p. 572, *seq.;* Hauschild, "*Tertullians Psychologie*," 1880; Hauck, "*Tert. Leben und Schriften*," 1877; Noeldechen, "*Tertullian*," 1890; works on the "History of Doctrine," by Hagenbach, Neander, Baur, Shedd, Sheldon, Crippen, Harnack, Loofs, Fisher, Seeberg, etc.; encyclopedia articles on "Tertullian."

a. Sketch. Tertullian (*b.* 150–160) was a native of Carthage and the son of a Roman proconsular centurion. He was educated in Roman law and in the liberal arts, and had attained to considerable eminence before his conversion. He also acquired familiarity with the Greek language, and is said to have written some works in it. He was greatly influenced by Stoic philosophy in its later form, as is manifest in his theological thinking. He is the first Christian writer in whom Roman law and Stoic philosophy appear as determining elements. His conversion may have occurred about 180, under what influence we are not informed. His ability and zeal soon led to his appointment as a presbyter in the Carthaginian church. His able and voluminous Latin writings laid the foundations for Latin theology. He was the first important Christian writer to use this language, and he forged it into shape for Cyprian, Lactantius, Jerome, and Augustine. According to Jerome, "he was a man of sharp and vehement temper." He had little in common with the Platonising theologians, and had no patience with Gnostic theosophy. "He apprehended Christianity . . . eminently in its opposition to all the pallid wisdom of philosophy, as a mighty supernatural reality, a divine foolishness wiser than men, creating and transmuting, challenging and disdaining contradiction. His was a fiery nature, rich in fantasy, witty and passionate, and inclined to paradox, at the same time endowed with a certain amount of Oriental (Punic) warmth and sensuousness, but also with a good share of Roman sense of what is solid and effective."[1]

In mid-career his views underwent an important change. By way of reaction against laxity in discipline, that was so glaringly and scandalously manifest in the Roman church under Zephyrinus, he was carried away by the rigor and enthusiasm of the Montanists. While there is no lack of zeal and fervor in his earlier writings, the later are still more intense and are characterized by the forms of teaching peculiar to Montanism. His works are too voluminous to be adequately described in this chapter. The more important ones will be referred to in connection with the characterization of his chief adversaries and the statement of his distinctive doctrinal positions. He seems to have been a born fighter and throughout his career to have been much engaged in controversy. He is pre-eminently the polemicist of the age.

b. Adversaries of Tertullian. (*a*) The *Monarchians* or Patripassians, as represented by Praxeas, who had combated Montanism in Asia Minor and "when the bishop of Rome had acknowledged the prophetic gifts of Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla, and . . . had bestowed his peace on the churches of Asia and Phrygia," had "by importunately urging false accusations against the prophets themselves and their churches . . . compelled him to recall the pacific letter which he had issued."

---

[1] Möller, "Ch. Hist.," Vol. I., p. 203.

He availed himself of his visit to Rome to disseminate there his Monarchian views of the Godhead. By this visit "Praxeas did a two-fold service for the devil at Rome. He drove away prophecy, and he brought in heresy; he put to flight the Paraclete, and he crucified the Father."[1]

Monarchianism had become widespread by the beginning of the third century. The ground of it may be stated thus: Up to about 175 most of the Christian writers had represented Christ as the pre-existent Logos, and in a way that seemed to imply subordination. In opposition to Ebionism the church gradually freed itself from this implied subordinationism. But the difficulty now was that of seeming to postulate two Gods. Hence those that held to a distinction between Father and Son, and yet refused to admit the subordination of the latter, were stigmatized as "ditheists." Those that rejected the Gnostic Docetism, the Ebionotic denial of Christ's Divinity, and the setting up of two equal personalities, were driven to views like those of Noëtus and Sabellius. The most decided opposition to this tendency was that offered by Montanism. Tertullian's treatise, "*Adversus Praxean*," is the ablest contemporary refutation of Monarchianism.

(*b*) *Paganism*, as represented by idolatry, vicious spectacular exhibitions, the persecution of Christians, etc. Tertullian displays his great rhetorical powers to best advantage in his denunciation of paganism and in his eulogizing of Christianity by way of contrast.

(*c*) The various *Gnostic systems* that were combated also by Irenæus and Hippolytus. Tertullian's fiery African nature did not permit him to reason calmly, and here, as in all his polemics, he is too denunciatory and fails to give his adversaries credit for the good that their systems contain. Yet Tertullian probably did more to overthrow Gnosticism than any other man.

(*d*) The *Jews*. The "Answer to the Jews" was occasioned by a discussion that occurred between a Christian and a Jewish proselyte. The reasoning is not very different from that of Justin in his "Dialogue with Trypho."

c. Tertullian and Montanism. Tertullian was the great theologian of the Montanistic movement. His conversion to Montanism was probably a gradual one, and occurred when he was already of mature age. The genius of Tertullian was too great to exhaust its influence upon a sect. In Latin theology nothing had appeared at all comparable with his writings, and we may suppose that they were eagerly read throughout the Latin churches. Tertullian was so stanch a defender of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity that his authority was everywhere great, notwithstanding his Montanism, and through him Montanistic views were infiltrated into the dominant form of Christianity in the succeeding time.

---

[1] "*Adversus Praxean*," Chap. 1.

d. Theology of Tertullian. (*a*) With regard to the *Godhead*. As an opponent of Monarchianism, especially in the form of Patripassianism, Tertullian held most tenaciously to the distinction of the Father and the Son. No earlier writer had expressed himself with so much precision on the doctrine of the Trinity. His clearest statement is found in his treatise "*Adversus Praxean,*" Chap. 2:

> We believe in one only God, yet under this dispensation, which we call "economy," that the one only God has a Son, his Word (*sermo*), who proceeds from himself, through whom all things were made, and without whom was made nothing. That this Son was sent by the Father into a virgin and was born of her, man and God, Son of Man and Son of God, and named Jesus Christ; that he suffered, that he died and was buried, according to the Scriptures, that he was resuscitated by the Father and taken back into heaven, that he sits at the right hand of the Father, that he will come to judge the living and the dead; who has sent thence from the Father according to his promise the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, the sanctifier of the faith of those that believe in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

And farther on:

> And nevertheless the sacrament of the "economy" is guarded, which disposes unity into trinity, arranging three, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; three, however, not in state but in degree; not in substance but in form; not in power but in aspect; but of one substance and of one state and of one power, because it is one God from whom those degrees and forms and aspects, in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are reckoned.

He remarks (in Chap. 3) that the greater number of the Christians of his time, having just abandoned polytheism, are in mortal dread of the "economy," "presuming that a numbering and disposition of trinity is a division of unity." Tertullian maintains that "unity deriving trinity out of its very self is not destroyed, but administered thereby." Again (in Chap. 9): "For the Father is the whole substance, as he himself informs us: 'The Father is greater than I'; but the Son is a derivation and portion of the whole." Thus Tertullian distinctly formulates a doctrine of the Trinity, but he seems to deny the co-eternity and co-equality of Son and Spirit with the Father. Largely as a result of his Stoical training, Tertullian was materialistic and could not allow that God himself was immaterial and formless.

(*b*) With regard to *man's original and actual condition*, Tertullian advances views far more developed than those of any of his predecessors. In answer to Marcion's cavil that if God had been good and prescient and potent, he would not have allowed man to fall into sin, Tertullian argues that "God alone is good by nature, for he who has what is without beginning has it not by institution, but by nature. But man, who is altogether by institution, having beginning, with beginning was allotted a form in which he should be, and so was determined to the good, not by nature, but by institution, not having as his own to be good, because not by nature was he determined to the good, but by institution, according to the Good Institutor, that is to say, the Maker of good things."

He adds that free will was given to man in order that he might attain unto a good of his own analogous to that of God. Had man remained subject to the Divine will he would have been exalted above the angels. Sin consisted in the fact that man sought to free himself from subjection to the Divine will. If God had restrained man from sin it would have involved a withdrawal of freedom from man, which was potentially the instrument of his highest good.

Here also the influence of Stoicism is manifest. The Stoics held that evil is necessary for the production of moral virtue, that there is no virtue where there is no choice, and that man was created free to choose.[2]

After the fall the "corruption of [man's] nature is

---

[1] "*Adversus Marcionem*," Bk. II., Chap. 5-9.
[2] Compare Hatch, "Hibbert Lectures," p. 231.

another nature, having its own god and father, namely, the author of corruption himself, yet so that there inheres also that principal, that divine and true (*germanum*), and properly natural, good of the soul. For what is from God is not so much extinguished as beclouded. It can be beclouded, because not God; it cannot be extinguished, because from God."[1]

Man, therefore, assisted by the grace of God, freely bestowed upon all through Christ, is capable by the seed of good that remains in him of turning unto God and attaining to salvation.

Tertullian was the first, so far as we know, to formulate the doctrine of the transmission of the soul by propagation from parent to child, known in the history of doctrine as "Traducianism." His psychology is somewhat materialistic, in harmony with his Stoic mode of thought. He defines the soul[2] as "born of the truth of God, immortal, corporeal, having form, simple of substance, . . free of will, obnoxious to accidents, mutable through natural dispositions, rational, dominating, divining, multiplying from one." Elsewhere he gives an account of a Montanist prophetess, who professed to have seen a soul and attempted to describe its outward appearance.

(*c*) *Baptism.* No Christian writer of the early centuries wrote so extravagantly regarding the magical effects of water baptism. His attitude toward baptism was due in some measure to his Stoical conception of the essential unity of matter and spirit (materialistic monism).

The treatise "*De Baptismate*" begins: "Blessed is our sacrament of water, in that, by washing away the sins of our early blindness, we are liberated into eternal life." Again: "But we, little fishes, after the example of our ΙΧΘΥΣ Jesus Christ [the letters of this Greek word meaning fish are the initials for 'Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour,' and the picture of a fish was a very common sign among the early Christians], are born in water" (Chap. 1). He dilates on the age and the *dignity* of water as the primeval element on which the Divine Spirit brooded. "Water was the first to produce that which had life, that it might be no wonder in baptism if waters knew how to give life" (Chap. 3). He argues that "the Spirit of God, who hovered over (the waters) from the beginning, would continue to linger over the waters of the baptized." "Thus," he continues, "the nature of the waters, sanctified by the Holy One, itself conceived withal the power of sanctifying." Again: "All waters, therefore, in virtue of the pristine privilege of their origin, do, after invocation of God, attain the sacramental power of sanctification." Again: "Therefore, after the waters have been in a manner endued with medicinal virtue through the intervention of the angel, the spirit is corporeally washed in the waters, as the flesh is in the same spiritually" (Chap. 4). He calls attention to the lustral rites of various heathen peoples and the magical efficacy ascribed thereto, but it does not seem to occur to him that he is paganizing. Rather he argues that "if the mere nature of water . . . leads men to flatter themselves with a belief in omens of purification, how much more will waters render that service through the authority of God, by whom all their nature has been constituted" (Chap. 5).

---

[1] "*De Anima*," 46.

[2] *Ibid.*, 22.

Tertullian earnestly dissuades from the practice of *baptizing little children* (not infants), which appears to have been becoming somewhat common in his time. He is insisting[1] upon the utmost care in the administration of baptism, lest those should be baptized who have not a proper understanding of the efficacy of the ordinance and the obligations it entails. Believing as he did in the unpardonableness of post-baptismal sins, he thought that no one should be baptized who was not in a position to guard his life most scrupulously from the moment of his baptism.

"Let them come," he says, "while they are adolescent, while they are learning, while they are being taught wherefore they come; let them become Christians when they become able to know Christ." Tertullian opposed the baptism of little children, but not on absolutely correct principles. The custom that he is arguing against appears to have been the baptism of children who were large enough to "hasten to the remission of sins," but who yet had no proper idea of Christianity. On the same ground Tertullian argues that the unmarried and virgins ought to delay their baptism until they have passed through their maturity.

(*d*) State of *Christian life* represented in the writings of Tertullian. The opposition between the worldly Christians and the ascetical, legalistic, Montanistic party had reached its climax. Abundant evidence of the corruption of morals in the churches, and of the growing tendency toward episcopacy, which Tertullian as a presbyter combats, is furnished by the writings of Tertullian.

---

[1] "*De Baptismate*," 17.

e. The Carthaginian Church. It is not known just how or when Christianity was first introduced into Carthage, but almost certainly from Rome, in the first half of the second century. Carthage had by this time come to be one of the great cities of the world. Africa was the chief source of grain supply for Italy, and Carthage was its commercial center. It had adopted the language of Rome and had developed considerable intellectual activity. It combined the licentious idolatry of the East with the luxury and extravagance of Rome. It is described by an ancient writer as the Rome of Africa and as surpassing all other cities in corruption and vice.

Yet Christianity found acceptance here among all ranks of people, even the highest, and from this centre spread all over Proconsular Africa. By the close of the second century the Christians numbered many thousands. A distinct type of Christianity was naturally developed here, combining Roman organization with African fire and impetuosity. In all matters the North African Christians seem to have tended to extremes. Nowhere else did such violent schisms occur during this period. Carthaginian Christianity had little of the speculative spirit of the Alexandrian, and its speculative heresies (Gnosticism, Monarchianism, etc.) were chiefly importations.

Here, as at Rome, opposition soon arose between the strict and the lax elements. It is only necessary to read Tertullian's treatises concerning Idolatry, Spectacular Exhibitions, Chastity, Modesty, and Veiling of Virgins, to be convinced of the corruption in which a part of the Carthaginian Christian community was involved. We learn that the virgins or nuns of the church were fond of fine dress and of attending the public baths (no sign of modesty); that makers of idols were sometimes admitted into the church, urging in defense of their conduct inability to support themselves otherwise; that Christians could not be restrained from witnessing spectacular exhibitions; and that drunkenness, gluttony, and lust abounded. Such things were condemned by the strict Montanistic party, which, driven to despair by the condition of the church, doubtless became somewhat fanatical in its zeal for purity and separation from the world, exalting virginity, insisting upon abstemiousness in regard to every human pleasure, being zealous for martyrdom, etc.

Fanaticism in religion almost always springs from despair in relation to the actual state of things and opposition encountered in efforts for reform.

(4) *Cyprian.*

LITERATURE: "*Cypriani Omnia Opera*," various editions, Erasmus, Fell, Goldhorn, Hartel, etc. (A critical edition of Cyprian is a desideratum); Pontius, "*De Vita Cypriani*"; Eusebius, "*Hist. Ecc.*," Bk. VII., Chap. 3; Lactantius, Bk. V., Chap. 1; English translation of Cyprian's works in "Ante-Nicene Fathers"; Neander, "Ch. Hist.," Vol. I., *passim*; Pressensé, "Mart. and Apol.," pp. 414, *seq.*; Poole, "Life and Times of Cyprian"; Rettberg, "*Cyprianus nach seinem Leben und Wirken*"; Long, in "Baptist Quarterly," 1877; O. Ritschl, "*Cyp. von Carthago*," 1885; Greenwood, "*Cathedra Petri*," Vol. I.; Tillemont, "*Mémoires*," *Tom.* IV., p. 76, *seq.*; "St. Cyprian's Correspondence" in "Church Quarterly Review," July, 1891; Goetz, "*Gesch. d. Cypr. Litteratur*," 1891; Le Provost, "*Etude philosophique et littéraire sur St. Cyprien*," 1888; Freppel, "*St. Cyprien et l'Eglise d'Afrique*," Third Edition, 1889; Böhringer, "*Biographien*," *Bd.* I., *Th.* 2, *Seit.* 813-1039; Benson, "Life of St. Cyprian"; encyclopedia articles, especially "Herzog," and "Dict. of Chr. Biog."

a. Sketch. Cyprian was born in Proconsular Africa, probably in Carthage, about 200. Like Tertullian, he was the son of a Roman officer and was educated as a rhetorician. He was a brilliant teacher of rhetoric before his conversion to Christianity. Having adopted Christianity, he at once became zealous in defense of it, and devoted his ample means to Christian purposes. He was an ardent admirer of Tertullian, and may be regarded as his disciple. Cyprian became bishop of the Carthaginian church so shortly after his conversion as to cause much dissatisfaction among the presbyters. But the Christian community had become so impressed with his sanctity and his fitness for the highest position in the North African Church, that he was enthusiastically appointed, notwithstanding the opposition.

The Decian persecution soon broke upon the North African Church. The fury of Decius was directed particularly against the bishops. When Cyprian could no longer remain at Carthage with any safety, he went into retirement. This exposed him to the charge of unfaithfulness on the part of his enemies; yet he probably had a truer view of Christian duty than those who courted martyrdom. His letters to the people during this period of separation show that he felt the profoundest solicitude for their welfare. Having returned, he suffered martyrdom under Valerian (258).

b. Theological Position of Cyprian. Though far inferior to Tertullian in learning and philosophical ability, Cyprian has always held a high place among the Fathers of the Church. He transferred the life and theology of Tertullian into the Catholic Church. Though a man of great holiness, Cyprian may be said to have done more for the development of hierarchical views than any man of this age. The circumstances under which he was placed, the difficulties he had to encounter, together with the remarkable administrative powers and predilections which were his by nature, led him to take a position in advance of his age in favor of hierarchical principles.

Cyprian was the first to establish clearly the distinction between presbyters and bishops, and the primacy of the Roman church as the *Cathedra Petri*.

(*a*) *The distinction between presbyters and bishops.* We have seen that up to the time of Irenæus the distinction between presbyters and bishops was by no means clear. The distinction, firmly established from the time of Cyprian, was brought about in the following way: The churches had come to be large bodies difficult to manage, especially in times of persecution. The collection and distribution of alms had assumed vast proportions, and the superintendence of this work devolved upon the bishop. The bishop was chairman of the board of presbyters and the leader of the church in the administration of discipline. Presbyters often disagreed, and the feeling grew that there should be in each Christian community a center of authority, whereby schism might be prevented and unity preserved. This was especially the case in large cities, where a single organization was maintained, with many places of worship, each presided over by a presbyter of the church. Occasions would frequently arise for the interference of the bishop, and when the need for episcopal authority came to be strongly felt the vindication of such authority was sure to follow.

In general, a struggle took place between the aristocratical government of the presbyters and the monarchical government of the bishops. Bishops when they had strong governing talent and were popular, gradually gained the upper hand; so, especially, did it happen in Cyprian's struggle with the Carthaginian presbyters. The triumph of episcopacy undoubtedly promoted for the time tranquillity and order; but it was unfriendly to the free development of ecclesiastical life and led to the sacerdotalism of a later time.

Cyprian, while in retirement, still attempted to give direction to the church of Carthage, and instructed the presbyters as to the administration. Whenever he had to decide anything without consulting the presbyters, he was careful to excuse himself. But many such cases occurred and the precedent was established.

Yet Cyprian conceded to the people the right of choosing worthy bishops, and of rejecting unworthy ones. The fact that he himself was elected by popular vote, and even against the desire of some of the presbyters, was enough to secure his recognition of this right. But the very popularity of Cyprian enabled him to triumph over the presbyters, just as Hildebrand, at a later time, triumphed over the bishops by arousing the people against them.

He was a genuine pastor, and had the profoundest regard for the welfare of each member of the flock. He had administrative plans, and he insisted on executing them. The interests of the people must be regarded, whether the presbyters concurred or not. His motives seem to have been pure; but when the same method came to be applied by less worthy bishops, great abuses resulted.

(*b*) *The doctrine of the supremacy of the Roman Church as the Cathedra Petri, and the center of unity of the one Universal Church.* Irenæus had insisted upon the unity of the church; but it was a spiritual unity, resulting from community of headship in Christ and from community of belief, as handed down through a succession of presbyters, *not* an external, organic unity. The general tendency of the church from this time forward was toward making religion external; and the idea of the spiritual unity of the church was easily transformed into that of outward unity.

The same tendency that led to the centralization of power in the bishop, for the sake of securing unity and order, led to a centralization of power in a head of the universal church. If the church was an outward, organic unity, it needed a single mouthpiece, just as much as did a single community. Controversies were arising everywhere among bishops. A supreme bishop—a bishop of bishops—was needed to adjudicate upon these controversies. There arose thus in the minds of Cyprian and others a desire for such a unifying, authoritative power; but it is noticeable that such a power was desired only on the supposition that the authoritative head would decide justly, *i. e.*, on Cyprian's side. The thought never occurred to Cyprian, perhaps, of submitting to an unjust decision, *i. e.*, one against himself.

In his work, "*De Unitate Ecclesiæ*," Cyprian makes use of such language as this: "The primacy was given to Peter, that one church of Christ and one chair might be pointed out." "Does he believe that he is in the faith, who does not hold this unity of the church? Does he trust that he is in the church who strives against and resists the church? who deserts the *Cathedra Petri* on which the church has been founded?" "There is one episcopate, by the single members of which each part is held in solidity." "Just as there are many rays of the sun, but one light; and many branches of the tree, but one strength, founded on the tenacious root; and since from one source many streams flow forth, the numerosity may seem diffused by the bounty of the surging stream, nevertheless unity in origin is preserved. Pluck a ray of the sun from the body, the unity of the light does not receive a division." "He cannot have God for his Father who has not the church for his mother."

There is considerable ground for skepticism regarding the authenticity of these strong expressions regarding the *Cathedra Petri* and the primacy of the Roman bishop. While there is no documentary basis for the theory of interpolation, it seems improbable that the Cyprian who was so self-assertive in his intercourse with the bishops of the Roman church in his time should have sought to exalt the authority of these very bishops. But it may be that the object he had in view in writing this treatise led him to forget for the time his personal attitude toward the incumbents of the Roman See.

c. Adversaries of Cyprian. (*a*) *With regard to the treatment of the "lapsed."* Large numbers of nominal

Christians were led by physical fear or love of property to deny the faith. When persecution had ceased these clamored for re-admission into the churches. Martyrs and confessors had always been highly esteemed. Some of these were supposed to have made dying requests for the restoration of the fallen. In the eyes of many this was a sufficient ground for indiscriminate restoration. A certain Lucian claimed to have been directed by a well-known confessor, Paul, to give "letters of peace" to all the lapsed, and accordingly spread such letters broadcast through the North African churches. In many cases the lapsed, with these letters in their hands, overawed presbyters and bishops; but Cyprian was not to be thus overawed. The decided stand that he took on this matter brought him into controversy not only with the confessors, but also with some of the presbyters (those chiefly that were already against him), and with the Roman church, which was in favor of leniency toward the lapsed.

Cyprian adopted a middle course: Those who showed signs of true penitence and whose sins had not been particularly grave, were to be restored; others, not. This was one of the hardest battles Cyprian had to fight; and in the course of it he was led to assert the divine right of bishops as successors of the apostles, appointed by God himself and acting in the name of Christ, and their supremacy over presbyters.

(*b*) *With regard to the administration of church finances, etc.* Novatus was one of the presbyters who opposed the election of Cyprian. In direct opposition to Cyprian's wish he soon appointed (or caused to be chosen) Felicissimus as deacon in his church. The opposition between Cyprian and Novatus and Felicissimus was long and fierce. Before Cyprian's return from exile, he sent two bishops and two presbyters to examine into the condition of the churches and to make a schedule of all the poor who were to be supported from the church funds, with notices of their ages, their conduct in persecution, etc. They were directed to give to the poor from the church funds what they needed for immediate support and to give to mechanics who had lost everything in persecution, money for purchasing tools, etc. Felicissimus, as deacon and treasurer, refused to allow Cyprian to meddle with the finances of Novatus' church. This church now became the resort of many of the lapsed, and a schism was effected with Felicissimus at its head. A council was called by Cyprian, and Felicissimus and his party were condemned. Both parties appealed to Rome, and although the Roman church agreed with Felicissimus with regard to the treatment of the lapsed, it refused to recognize a party that was looked upon as schismatical. The party of Felicissimus never became strong.

(*c*) *With regard to the validity of heretical baptism.* After the rise and diffusion of schismatical bodies, persons frequently sought admission into the churches who had been baptized in these. The churches of Asia Minor maintained the invalidity of heretical baptism. This principle was rigidly adhered to by the Montanists, and had come from Tertullian to Cyprian. The opponents of Montanism soon began to oppose re-baptism.

In 255 Cyprian secured the convening of a council, which decided in favor of the stricter principle; although in 253, Stephen, bishop of Rome, had excommunicated the bishops of Asia Minor for holding to this view, stigmatizing them as "Anabaptists." It is wonderful how Cyprian's tone, in correspondence with the Roman bishop, varies according to circumstances. He now writes to Stephen, giving him the decision of the African council and the reasons for it, without once alluding to any authority of the Roman bishop to reverse the decision. The tone is somewhat bold and defiant.

(*d*) *With regard to the competency of the church to forgive the lapsed.* Cyprian's views on this subject are historically connected with the Novatian schism, discussed above. It is remarkable, that although Cyprian tended toward the Montanistic rigor he was prevented from supporting the Novatianists by two considerations: First, that the extreme position drove men to despair, and he was wise enough to see that it was impracticable; secondly, that the Novatianist party had broken the unity of the church by setting up a bishop in opposition to a duly consecrated, and hence divinely appointed, bishop. Cyprian could endure anything rather than see the unity of the church broken. The idea of the one Universal Church was gaining a strong hold upon men's minds in Cyprian's time, and any party that should break this unity was sure to be repudiated by the most influential Christians and churches, however holy the life or pure the doctrine of such party.

V. THE SCIENTIFIC PERIOD.

Alexandria at the beginning of the Christian era was the most cosmopolitan city in the world. Oriental and Occidental culture met and blended there as nowhere else. The Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy, as seen most fully developed in the writings of Philo, was one of the most noteworthy products of the eclecticism that there prevailed. Nowhere was a new religion or philosophy so sure of a hospitable hearing. Here Gnosticism and speculative Ebionism flourished. The first introduction of Christianity into the city is veiled in obscurity. Tradition points to Mark as the founder of the Alexandrian church. A distinct mode of theological thought, of which Pantænus, Clement, and Origen were the great exponents, was here developed. Shortly after the middle of the second century a catechetical school was established for the instruction of the children of believers and fresh converts from paganism in the fundamentals of Christian doctrine and morals. The first teacher of whom we have information was Pantænus, whom his more distinguished pupil praises, but whose writings have not survived. The instruction at first must have been very elementary in its nature. Under Clement, who succeeded Pantænus, the school grew in popularity, and the instruction became more scientific. Clement having fled from Alexandria during the persecution under Severus (202 or 203), Origen, a mere youth, became teacher. Under him, the school rose to its highest point (202–230), attracting large numbers of pagans and Gnostics, as well as Christians. Clement and Origen may be regarded as the first really scientific students of Christianity and the Christian Scriptures; the first, the Gnostic bodies excepted, who attempted to reduce Christianity to a consistent, harmonious system. Alexandria continued to be a chief center of Christian thought and influence until the seventh century.

1. General Characteristics.

(1) Earlier Christian writers like Irenæus, Hippolytus, and Tertullian, had discussed individual doctrines with special reference to attacks made upon them by heretics. But the idea seems never to have occurred to them to make a *systematic exposition of Christianity as a whole;* to apply comprehensive principles to the interpretation of Scripture; to compare systematically the different parts of Scripture among themselves. Such a study of Christianity was begun toward the close of the second century at Alexandria.

(2) Alexandria being the seat of speculative philosophy, whence most of the elements of Gnosticism had come, it might have been expected that Christianity, after it had become well established here, would assume a *speculative form.*

(3) The Alexandrian theologians with whom the scientific spirit had its birth, were *Platonists* (with a strong admixture of Pythagoreanism and Stoicism). Not that they had been simply brought up Platonists (as were Justin and Athenagoras, who yet, after they adopted Christianity, rejected Platonism as the work of demons); but they remained Platonists, and sought to explain Christianity according to the Platonic categories, in somewhat the same way in which Philo had, two centuries earlier, attempted to explain Judaism. In fact these Christian Platonists were greatly indebted to Philo.

(4) The chief difference between the theology under discussion and that of the Gnostics is, that the representatives of the former were *decided Christians,* adhered to the historical, and admitted the divine authority of the Old and New Testaments; whereas, the latter had little sympathy with the spirit of Christianity, and paid no regard to the historical.

(5) Heretofore, the *allegorical interpretation* had been applied to the Scriptures, whenever it suited a writer's purpose. Allegorizing was now reduced to a system.

(6) In the profound speculations of this school of thought, with regard to the origin of evil, the Godhead, the will of man, the consummation of all things, etc., lay the *germs of many later doctrinal developments.*

273-283

2. *Individual Writers.*

(*1*) *Clement of Alexandria.*

LITERATURE: The best edition of the works of Clement is that of Dindorf, though this is very defective; Eng. tr. in "Ante-Nicene Fathers"; Eusebius, "*Hist. Ecc.*," Bk. V., Chap. 11, Bk. VI., Chap. 11, 13; Photius, "*Bibliotheca*," 109–111; Bunsen has made a clever attempt to reconstruct the "*Hupotuposeis*," from fragments preserved by Theodotus and Photius, in his "*Analecta Antenic.*," Vol. I., p. 159, *seq.*; Bigg, "The Chr. Platonists of Alexandria"; Hatch, "The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church," 1890; Kutter, "*Clem. Alex. und das N. T.*," 1897; Merk, "*Clem. Alex. in seiner Abhängigkeit von d. griech. Philosophie*," 1879; Lehmann, "*Die Katechetenschule zu Alexandrien*," 1896; sections on Clem. of Alex. in the works on the history of doctrine, by Loofs, Thomasius, Seeberg, Fisher, and Sheldon; Allen, "The Continuity of Christian Thought," p. 38, *seq.*; Harnack, "*Dogmengesch.*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 501, *seq.*; Zahn, "*Forschungen*," *Bd.* III., *Seit.* 17–176; Neander, Vol. I., p. 691, *seq.*; Schaff, Vol. II., p. 781, *seq.*; Mœller, p. 207, *seq.*; Pressensé, "Martyrs and Apologists," p. 540, *seq.*; Bunsen, "Hippolytus," Vol. I., p. 239, *seq.* (highly appreciative and apologetic); Mansel, "Gnostic Her.," p. 261, *seq.*; Dorner, "Person of Christ," Div. I., Vol. I., p. 285, *seq.*; Reinkens, "*De Clem. Alex.*"; Kling, in "*Studien u. Kritiken*," 1841; Westcott, art. "Clem. of Alex." in Smith's "Dict. of Ch. Biog.," and Bonwetsch, in "Herzog" (third edition).

a. Sketch. Clement was born about 160, probably at Athens. Having pursued studies under various masters, of various nationalities and of various religious and philosophical views, he at last found rest under the influence of Pantænus, the head of the catechetical school in Alexandria, whom he regarded as the greatest of them all. He always speaks of Pantænus (not often by name) in terms of the very highest praise. Pantænus was, in his view, the "deepest Gnostic," *i. e.*, possessed the most perfect insight into the significance of Christianity.

Clement was already profoundly versed in Greek philosophy and literature and knew something of Christianity when he came under the influence of Pantænus. The philosophical Christianity of Pantænus satisfied his needs and he devoted himself with ardor to theological studies. He succeeded Pantænus as teacher about 190, and continued in this work until about 202, when he was driven from his post by persecution. But he left behind him a pupil who soon took his place and gave still greater lustre to the school. He was probably the most accomplished Christian scholar before Origen. Greek, Gnostic, and Christian literature he had not only read, but mastered. His writings abound in apt quotations from the rich literature at his command. He was an elegant writer of Greek, and few early Christian writers are so attractive to the modern reader.

It was during his residence at Alexandria, and in connection with his duties as teacher, that he composed the writings on which his fame rests.

In Clement we see a man of a profoundly speculative mind, with a high appreciation for the true, the beautiful, and the good, wherever he might meet them, who attempted to form a harmonious system of Christianity in its relation to the universe. We find in his writings much that is noble and instructive, together with much that is fantastic and puerile.

It is in Clement that we see most clearly the influence of Greek philosophy upon Christian thought. His aims and aspirations were very similar to those of the great Gnostic leaders; but he had vastly more understanding for historical Christianity, and he rejected earnestly all the most dangerous of the Gnostic views. His work has been pronounced "epoch-making" (Harnack). He undertook the great task of preparing an introduction to or an initiation into that which is inmost and highest in Christianity.

b. Writings of Clement. The principal writings of Clement that have been preserved are: The "*Logos Protreptikos*," or "Address to the Greeks"; the "*Paidagogos*," or "Tutor"; the "*Stromateis*," or "Miscellanies"; and the "*Hupotuposeis*," or "Outlines of Scripture Interpretation."

The conception and the execution of this series of works has been declared by Overbeck to be "the boldest literary undertaking in the history of the church." He was the first to attempt "to represent Christianity in the forms of the profane world-literature for the Christian community itself." "The design of Clement is nothing less than an introduction to Christianity, or to speak more correctly and more in accordance with the spirit of the work, an initiation into Christianity. For . . . the task that Clement sets for himself is the introduction (of his readers) into that which is inmost and highest in Christianity itself. He aims, so to speak, with a work of literature to transform Christians into perfect Christians, with such a work to repeat for the Christian what the life has already otherwise accomplished for him, but to raise him up to something still higher than the forms of initiation that the church has provided itself with have disclosed. To this end, . . he translates the ideal career of a Christian of that time into the form of a book and requires this Christian to repeat the wandering in order henceforth to lead him to the highest aims thereof."[1]

"The gospel in his view is not a fresh departure, but the meeting-point of two converging lines of progress, Hellenism and Judaism. To him all history is one because all truth is one. 'There is one river of Truth,' he says, 'but many streams fall into it on this side and on that.' Among Christian writers none till very recent times, not even Origen, has so clear and grand a conception of the development of spiritual life."[2]

Clement regarded star-worship as a divinely given stepping-stone to a purer religion.[3] He compared truth to the body of Pentheus, torn to pieces by fanatics, each of whom imagines his fragment the whole.[4]

(*a*) *The "Address to the Greeks"* is probably the earliest of Clement's writings, and may have been composed about 190. The aim of the address is to prove to those conversant with Greek philosophy the infinite superiority of Christianity, in its adaptability to all human needs, in its purity, spirituality, clearness, and substantiality. The address abounds in eloquent passages. See especially his description of the mission of the Word and the true destiny of man (Chap. 11).

(*b*) *The "Pedagogue."* The aim of the "Address" was to win heathen to the acceptance of the gospel; the design of the "Pedagogue" was to convey elementary instruction to the young and to those that had just accepted Christianity. It is, therefore, an eminently practical work.

Book I. contains a description of our Pedagogue, Christ, his character, his method of dealing with his children. The Pedagogue is practical, not theoretical; his aim is to improve the soul, not to teach; and to train up to a virtuous, not to an intellectual life. Clement's theory is, that those coming to Christ from paganism need first to be cured of their corrupt habits and thoughts before special instruction in the doctrines of Christianity can profit them. The mercy and purity of Christ are emphasized and held up for imitation.

---

[1] See Herzog-Hauck, third edition, *Bd.* IV., *Seit.* 156, *seq.*

[2] Bigg, "The Chr. Platonists of Alex.," p. 47, *seq.*

[3] "*Stromateis,*" Bk. VI., Chap. 14.

[4] *Ibid.*, Bk. I., Chap. 13.

Books II. and III. consist of practical instructions as to eating, drinking, expensive vessels and furniture, behavior at feasts, laughter, filthy speaking, relations of the sexes, sleep, the procreation of children, clothes, ornaments, etc. The utmost simplicity and moderation in all things are insisted upon.

Book III. is exceedingly important for the light it throws upon the church life of the time, and the nature of the instruction required by the converts and given to them by Christian teachers.

(*c*) *The "Miscellanies."* This work consists of a conglomeration of extracts from pagan and Christian writers, interspersed with original comments and occasional prolonged discussions. The object of the whole is to awaken the interest and to exercise the ingenuity of the readers, and to show the infinite superiority of the Christian religion and philosophy to the pagan.

Book I. points out the office and origin of Greek philosophy in relation to Christianity and Judaism. It is claimed that the Greek philosophers borrowed directly from the Old Testament.

Book II. shows the superiority of biblical morality to that of heathen philosophy. Faith and repentance are discussed at length. Likeness to God is declared to be the ideal which Christians are to set before them.

Book III. contains a prolonged discussion of the doctrine of marriage; the licentious views of pagans and some Gnostics are stated and refuted. On the other hand, abstinence from marriage, on the ground of the evil nature of matter, is condemned. The standard biblical passages are thoroughly discussed in answer to erroneous interpretations of heretics.

Book IV. begins with a statement of Clement's plan for the defense of Christianity. He then describes the true "Gnostic" or Christian philosopher. Self-sacrifice that does not shrink from martyrdom, love, endurance, are among his traits. Although martyrdom is extolled, fanatical seeking for martyrdom is sharply reproved, and the views of certain Gnostics with regard to martyrdom are refuted. The perfect man does good neither for glory nor reputation, nor for reward either from men or God; but so as to pass life after the image and likeness of the Lord. He does good because he judges it right to do good.

Book V. discusses faith, hope, and enigmatic teaching. The mysteries of Pythagoreans, Egyptians, etc., are compared with those of the Bible; and the principle of symbolic teaching is vindicated. Here, also, he attempts to prove that the Greeks have borrowed from the Bible by citing numerous examples of supposed coincidence.

Book VI. continues the subject of plagiarism on the part of the

Greeks. He declares the Greeks to have some knowledge of God. He asserts that the gospel was preached in hades both by Christ and his apostles to those of the Hebrews and Greeks who were righteous according to the law and philosophy. Here, again, the Christian philosopher is described at great length. The delineation is continued through Book VII. This is the most important of the writings of Clement, and was designed for those who had already adopted Christianity, and had received the preliminary training prescribed in the "Pedagogue."

(*d*) *The* "*Outlines.*" Only fragments of this are preserved. It consisted of a commentary on large parts of the Old and New Testaments, written partly in refutation of false interpretations by heretics.

(*e*) The small treatise entitled "*Who is the Rich Man that is Saved?*" is an eloquent appeal for the right use of wealth.

c. Theology of Clement. (*a*) *God the Father* is the "remoter Cause (*i. e.*, than the Son), the Father of all things, the oldest and most beneficent of all, yet not representable by voice, but in reverence and silence with holy astonishment is to be venerated and adored in the most lordly manner." We see here the well-known Alexandrian (Platonic) tendency to exalt the Supreme Being above all relations to the world.[1]

(*b*) *The Son* is called the timeless and unoriginated Principle of existence, from whence we are to learn the remoter Cause.[2]

Again, having declared the pious man to be the best thing on earth, and an angel the best thing in heaven, he adds: "But most perfect and most holy, and most lordly and most princely, and most royal and most beneficent is the nature of the Son, which is nearest to the only Omnipotent One. This is the greatest excellence, which orders all things according to the will of the Father, and steers everything in the best way, . . for the Son of God is never displaced from his watch-tower, not being divided, not being severed, not passing from place to place, being always everywhere and contained nowhere; wholly mind, wholly paternal light, wholly eye, seeing all things, knowing all things; by power examining the powers."[3]

---

[1] "*Stromateis,*" Bk. VII., Chap. 1.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, Chap. 2.

This Being is further declared to be the same that Christians call Saviour and Lord. Inasmuch as the whole universe is under his government, he is Lord of the Greeks and barbarians. He it was who gave to the Greeks their philosophy. He cares continually for every human being.

The Son is declared to be the "power of God, as being the Father's most ancient Word, before the production of all things, and his Wisdom." He is declared "to have invested himself with flesh, and to have come for the salvation of men."[1]

Clement's representations of the Logos are various, some of them obscure; but we may safely say that he insisted upon the eternal existence of the Son as the Wisdom of God, and as God's instrument in the creation and the governing of the universe. We have here, in a less developed form, the "eternally begotten" Logos of Origen. This Logos, according to Clement, was of the very essence of the Father.

(*c*) *The Holy Spirit*. Clement has no clear statement on this subject, *i. e.*, no statement which enables us to see whether he distinguished the work of the Holy Spirit from the work of the Logos in Providence, in the human conscience, etc. He writes: "There is one Father of the universe; there is also one Word of the universe; and one Holy Spirit, who is everywhere."[2]

(*d*) *Anthropology*. Clement held most decidedly to the freedom of man's will; to the power of every man, through the incarnation and death of Christ, to overcome sensuality and to attain unto salvation.

He regarded man's original state as infantile and free. The account of the temptation he regarded as an allegory, meaning that man was overcome by sensuality. As a result of this, mankind has ever since had to contend against sensuality. Christ came to deliver man from the power of sin and death.[3]

Physical death he regarded as a natural necessity of the Divine economy following upon generation.[4] Regarding Christ's activity in human history as constant from the beginning, Clement supposed that Christ came in the flesh to show men the sufficiency of their powers for obeying God's commandments, by himself living in the flesh a life free from sin, thus overcoming sin and destroying the power of death. This he did as an example for men.[1]

---

[1] "*Stromateis*," Bk. VII., Chap. 2.

[2] See Bunsen's scheme of the complex representations of the Godhead by Clement, in "Hippolytus and his Age," Vol. I., p. 244.

[3] "*Protrept.*," Bk. XI.

[4] "*Stromateis*," Bk. III., Chap. 9.

To the Gnostic dilemma: "Man was created either perfect or imperfect; if imperfect, how is the work of a perfect God—especially man—imperfect? If perfect, how does he transgress the commandments?" Clement replies, that man was not made "perfectly equipped, but fitted for attaining to virtue; for it is important certainly for virtue, to be fitted for the possession of it. But he wishes us of ourselves to be saved. . . All, indeed, are fitted by nature for the acquiring of virtue; but one more, another less, advances in discipline and training. Wherefore, also, some have attained even unto perfect virtue; others have arrived at some; but others, again, through negligence, even if they were otherwise well-disposed, have been turned into the opposite."[2]

d. Ideal of Christian Life. In his delineations of the Christian philosopher, we see Clement's ideal. It is that of a man who by self-discipline and study has overcome all of his evil propensities, so that he is superior to all selfish motives, even the expectation of heavenly reward. He has risen to a state of exalted contemplation, so that he understands the methods of God's providential dealing, and the meaning of God's written word. Clement's system was, therefore, aristocratical. His gradation was: Christ, angels, Christian philosophers, the great bulk of Christians who never attain to perfection. Though it was far from Clement's intention, his views very naturally ministered to sacerdotalism.

Thus we see that Clement of Alexandria and his contemporary, Tertullian of Carthage, were antipodes in theological thought. The one had sympathies as broad as humanity; the other confined the saving efficacy of Christ to a particular type of Christian life, regarding not only all pagans, but all Christians, who did not conform to his narrow system, as reprobated. The one looked upon humanity and human life as inherently noble, and as capable of being raised by proper discipline to a state of perfection; the other, in constant expectation of the end of the world, regarded the present life as of no account except as a time of preparation for a future life; and he regarded that preparation as involving a constant crucifixion of the flesh. Clement believed in rational instruction as a means of attaining to exaltation of character; Tertullian enjoined an irrational asceticism.

---

[1] "*Stromateis*," Bk. VII., Chap. 2.

[2] *Ibid.*, Bk. VI., Chap. 12.

Clement went to an extreme in his humanitarianism, and was the forerunner of Pelagianism. Tertullian went to the opposite extreme, and was the forerunner of Monasticism, with its utter repudiation of human nature.

(2) *Origen.*

LITERATURE: Various editions of the complete works of Origen, of which the most convenient is that of Lommatzsch, in twenty-five volumes, 8vo; Eusebius, "*Hist. Ecc.*," Bk. VI., Chap. 1-6; Gregorius Thaumaturgus, "*Oratio Panegyrica in Orig.*" and Pamphilus, "*Apol. Orig.*" (Eng. tr. in "Ante-Nicene Fathers"); Jerome, "*Opera*," *passim;* Neander, Vol. I., pp. 543-557, 568-571, 587-592, 621-631, 636-640, 693-722, and *passim* (Neander is particularly valuable here); Pressensé, "Martyrs and Apologists," *passim;* Schaff, Vol. II., p. 785, *seq.;* Mœller, p. 209, *seq.;* Bigg, "The Chr. Platonists of Alex.,"; Harnack, "*Dogmengesch.*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 511, *seq.;* Dorner, "Person of Christ," Div. I., Vol. II., p. 104, *seq.;* Bunsen, "Hippolytus," Vol. I., p. 279, *seq.;* Thomasius, "*Origines*"; Redepenning, "*Origines*" (the best work on the life and teachings of Origen); Ritter, "*Gesch. der Chr. Philos.*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 465, *seq.;* works of Neander, Baur, Hagenbach, Shedd, Loofs, Seeberg, Fisher, and Sheldon, on the history of doctrine; encyc. articles, esp. Westcott, in "Dict. of Chr. Biog."

a. Sketch. Origen was born *c.* 185, of Christian parents, and from his childhood was favored with excellent religious training. While yet a child he could repeat from memory large parts of the Scriptures, and he often perplexed his intelligent father by the subtlety of his questions. His father, Leonides, suffered martyrdom about 202, Origen exhorting him to steadfastness, and being restrained with the utmost difficulty from offering himself up for martyrdom. From childhood throughout life he practised a rigorous asceticism; he possessed but one coat, and no shoes; rarely ate flesh, never drank wine; devoted much of the night to study and prayer, and slept on the bare floor.

After the departure of Clement he was appointed catechist in his place (203). His knowledge of Scripture and other literature was already considerable; but now he resolved to master the systems of the leading heretical bodies in order that he might successfully combat them. The Neo-Platonic philosophy was just coming

mysticism.

into prominence under the leadership of Ammonius Saccas. Origen studied the system carefully under its great representative. His reputation was soon widespread. Heathen and Gnostics in large numbers attended his lectures, and many were converted. Ambrosius, a wealthy Gnostic, was converted, and spent a large sum of money in purchasing an extensive library for Origen, and in facilitating the publication of his works. Julia Mammæa, mother of Alexander Severus, invited him to Antioch to expound to her the Christian religion. An Arabian prince secured a visit from him with like intent.

With a view to attaining a better understanding of the Old Testament, he mastered the Hebrew language under the most discouraging circumstances. He traveled, from time to time, to Rome, to Arabia, to Palestine, and to Greece.

While in Palestine, in 228, he was ordained a presbyter by Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistus of Cæsarea. This proceeding aroused the resentment of Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria. At two councils, called by Demetrius in 231 and 232, Origen was condemned for false doctrine, self-mutilation (committed in his youth in supposed obedience to the Saviour's injunction, Matt. 19 : 12, such mutilation, according to the most ancient ecclesiastical law, incapacitating one for ordination), and violation of church laws, and was deposed from his office. His study of philosophy and Gnosticism had not left him the simple believer it found him. With immensely more learning and logical consistency than Clement, Origen probably indulged in even wilder speculations than he.

He was the most learned man and one of the profoundest thinkers in the ancient church (Jerome was more learned in Hebrew), and probably exerted more influence on the doctrinal development of the church than any other man. He became involved in controversy during his lifetime, and after his death a series of controversies based upon his teachings set in that lasted for centuries.

The remainder of his life, after his departure from Alexandria, was spent chiefly in Palestine, where he died about 254, partly as a result of imprisonment and torture during the Decian persecution.

b. Writings of Origen. Origen was one of the most voluminous of writers. Jerome says that he wrote more than other men can read. Epiphanius estimates the whole number of his writings at about six thousand. Many have perished; others are preserved only in fragments; most that we have are in indifferent Latin translations.

(*a*) *Critical, Exegetical, and Edificatory Works on the Bible.* Origen was the first to study the Bible scientifically and critically. Clement's exegetical performances, so far as we can judge from the extant fragments, were insignificant in comparison. There is no writer of the early church to whom biblical criticism is so much indebted. Jerome would have been impossible without Origen. These biblical works are of three kinds:

Works on the Text—the Hexapla and Tetrapla—(the former an Old Testament Polyglot, with Hebrew, Hebrew in Greek letters, LXX., and three other Greek versions in parallel columns—the design being the restoration of the LXX. to purity; the latter containing only the four Greek versions). Only fragments of these have been preserved, but they are of exceeding value.

Commentaries, extending over almost the entire Bible. These, though they contain much that is fantastic, are full of information and highly suggestive.

Homilies, or familiar expository discourses, on large portions of the Bible.

(*b*) *Apologetical.* One of the maturest of Origen's works, and the one that throws most light on the relation of Christianity to paganism in Origen's time, is the work, "*Contra Celsum.*" Celsus, a Platonist (or Epicurean), had written a most scurrilous work against Christianity, probably during the reign of Marcus Aurelius. This appears to have been still employed by the pagans as an armory against Christianity in the time of Origen. Origen's refutation of pagan charges against Christianity is the ablest work of the kind that the early church produced.

(*c*) *Dogmatical.* Here the chief work is the "*De Principiis.*" This is the first attempt at a systematic exhibition of Christian doctrine. It was written some time before Origen's departure from Alexandria, and contains more of crude speculation than any other of his works. We possess this work only in the professedly unfaithful translation of Rufinus (Rufinus having omitted many of the more offensive expressions). It was published without his permission through the zeal of his patron Ambrosius. Here we find the fundamental Christian doctrines concerning God, the Father, Son, and Spirit, Free-will, Immortality, Eternity, Eternal Life, etc., speculatively discussed.

Specu

(*d*) *Practical Works*. Of these, the most important that have been preserved are, the treatise on Prayer, and that on Martyrdom. These show a man of great piety and Christian zeal. The work on Martyrdom was addressed to his friend Ambrosius in time of persecution, and is somewhat extravagant in its exaltation of martyrdom.

c. *Theology of Origen*. Origin distinguished carefully between those points of doctrine on which the Scriptures contain explicit statements, and those questions which, though not answered by Scripture, yet obtrude themselves upon the Christian thinker's mind. The latter class of questions must be answered, as far as possible, in conformity with the Scriptures; but still much ground is left for speculation. He believed strongly in allowing to every man the utmost freedom in considering such matters.

In his great dogmatic work, "*De Principiis*," accordingly, he sets out with a concise statement of the rule of faith of the universal church. There is nothing especially remarkable about this rule of faith; but having laid down this as a basis, he proceeds to the consideration of other questions not clearly answered by Scripture and ecclesiastical tradition.

as rea
have

(*a*) *Concerning God*. Origen first refutes materialistic views based upon expressions like: "Our God is a consuming fire," etc.; and proves that God is a Spirit, chiefly from New Testament passages. God is not only a Spirit, but is incomprehensible and inestimable.[1] His

creatu

---

[1] "*De Principiis*," Bk. I., Chap. 1.

idea of God, therefore, is that of pure, absolute Being (Platonic, seen also in Justin and Clement). He is knowable only through his works, and especially through his Son. As God was from eternity Father and Lord, the generation of the Son and the creation of the world are eternal processes. Origen could not think of the Absolute Being as having ever been idle.

(*b*) *The Son.* It was Origen's doctrine of the Son, more than any other of his doctrines, that played so important a part in later doctrinal development. Origen held that the Son was "begotten by the Father," yet that "there never was when he was not." The begetting then is an eternal effect of the Father, yet is not to be regarded as a projection or emanation from the being or substance of the Father, in a way that would involve diminution or division thereof. The Father is the originating cause of the Son, the Son of all other creatures. The begetting of the Son is an act of God's will, and in so far the Son is a creature. On the other hand, he is uncreated, God of God, of the Divine nature and essence. The Son differs from creatures in having his being immediately from the primal source, and in that his divine nature is essential, independent, and inalienable. The Son, or the Logos, contains in himself all ideas which are realized in the world (Platonic). He constitutes the rational element in all intelligent creatures. The activity of the Logos in the guidance and instruction of the human race is coeval with the race. He gave the law, inspired the prophets, and enlightened the heathen, so far as they have any religious or moral knowledge. The work of the Logos is to lead all intelligent creatures, step by step, upward to the contemplation of God. From the human he leads up to the angelic; from the angelic to the archangelic. To men he appears as man; to angels as an angel.

(*c*) *The Holy Spirit* Origen regarded as the first and most exalted of all beings produced by the Father through the Son. His activity differs from that of the Logos, in that the latter extends to all creatures, whereas the former appears only in connection with the dispensation of God's grace.

(*d*) *Anthropology.* Origen held that in the original world there were only spiritual existences. Many of these spirits, having been created pure, apostatized from God. The material world was created out of nothing, to be the abode of fallen spirits, the object being at the same time penal and reformatory. The account of Adam's fall in Genesis Origen regarded as an allegorical representation of the fate of the whole class of fallen, embodied spirits. Origen held to the Platonic trichotomy of human nature: the material body, dead in itself; the soul, or vital principle, which man has in common with beasts; the spirit, which he has as participating in the being of the Logos.

By his apostasy, man's reason is darkened; he is deprived of the true spiritual life; he is under the influence of Satan; yet his will is free to choose good or evil.

The redemption wrought by Christ consisted in his uniting in himself the human and the divine; in his example, his teachings, his miracles, his death—which redeemed man from the power of Satan.

Origen thus believed in the vicarious sacrifice of Christ. Christ is a sacrifice, not merely for all men, but for fallen angels. The merit of Christ must be appropriated by each individual through faith. By believing in Christ we become like him in character. Origen distinguished gradations in Christian life: mere faith, knowledge, wisdom.

The power to will and to do comes from God; choice of good rests with man; after choice for good, all needful assistance in the perfecting of Christian character is furnished by the Holy Spirit.

(*e*) *Baptism.* Believing, as he did, that children are born into the world polluted by sin, hence that little children need remission of sins, and believing as he did in the efficacy and necessity of baptism for the remission of sins, Origen spoke approvingly of the baptism of little children as a well-established custom of the churches.

(*f*) *Eschatological Views.* Origen did not believe in a resurrection of the material body; the resurrection body, he thought, would have the same *form*, but not the same substance as the present. It would not be a body of flesh and blood, but a spiritual body.

Origen had a firm belief in the final restoration of harmony in the spiritual world. The end is to be as was the beginning. Even the damned and devils, he supposed, would, after having undergone sufficient disciplinary punishment, be brought into voluntary subjection to Christ.

d. Method of Scripture Interpretation. Origen was the first to reduce the allegorical method of interpretation to a system. The allegorical interpretation of Scripture had been extensively employed by the great Jewish-Alexandrian thinkers, Aristobulus and Philo. It had been taken up by the Gnostics, and was practised by most of the Christian writers of the early time. The aim of the allegorical interpretation was to harmonize the Scriptures, which were regarded as divinely inspired, with the Platonic modes of thought, which had become, as it were, part and parcel of the being of such Christians as Origen. Had Origen been shut up to a literal interpretation of the Old Testament, he would, probably, like the Gnostics, have rejected the Old Testament and the God of the Old Testament.

He held, therefore, in accordance with the Platonic trichotomy, that every passage of Scripture has three senses, the literal, the moral, and the spiritual.

To the *literal* (earthly, sensual, carnal, Jewish) sense, he attached little importance, save as a basis for the higher senses; but his chief merit as an exegete consists in the fact that he did industriously seek to ascertain this literal sense. The literal sense is not always true.

But there underlies every passage a deeper sense (celestial, intelligible, symbolical, mystical, secret), which is distinguished into the *moral* and the *spiritual* sense.

The *moral* sense is that which relates to matters connected with religious life.

The *spiritual* sense is that which relates to the heavenly life, the world to come.

e. Influence of Origen on the Later Church. (*a*) His method of Scripture interpretation was soon adopted throughout the church (except the Antiochian school, which went to the opposite extreme of adhering rigidly to the literal meaning), and prevailed throughout the Middle Ages. In this particular Origen's influence was bad, and only bad. Yet his views on the literal meaning have always been of great utility.

(*b*) The effect of his bold, wild speculations was two-fold: (1) Many were led astray by his example, while (2) others were frightened by his boldness into a denial of the right of freedom of thought.

We cannot say that the great doctrinal controversies of the fourth and following centuries would not have taken place except for the speculations of Origen; but as a matter of fact they almost all centered around the points on which he had speculated most boldly. If the formulating of Christian doctrine which took place in the Nicene and following ages was a beneficent consummation, then Origen's merit in this direction was very great. If those fierce theological controversies were evil and hurtful to the progress of the kingdom of Christ, then Origen's responsibility was great.

"Origen may well be placed side by side with Augustine as one of the two most important and most influential theologians of the ancient church. He is the father of ecclesiastical science in the broadest sense of the word, and at the same time the founder of that theology which in the fourth and fifth centuries reached its full development and which in the sixth century definitely denied its originator, yet without losing the impress that he had given it. Origen created ecclesiastical dogmatics, and he laid the foundation for the science of the sources of the Jewish and Christian religion. He proclaimed the reconciliation of science with the Christian faith, of the highest culture with the gospel."—*Harnack.*

(3) *Gregory Thaumaturgus.*

LITERATURE: Text in "Migne," Vol. X., p. 983, *seq.* (Eng. tr. in "Ante-Nic. Lib.," Am. ed., Vol. VI., p. 7, *seq.*); Ryssel, "*Greg. Thaumaturgus, sein Leben u. s. Schriften,*" 1881; articles in "Dict. of Chr. Biog.," Herzog-Hauck, and Schaff-Herzog.

Gregory Thaumaturgus, one of the most distinguished of Origen's disciples, was born at Neo-Cæsarea in Pontus (*c.* 210). Having been led to take an interest in Christianity he availed himself of an opportunity to visit Cæsarea (Palestine), where Origen was laboring. He was by this great teacher led into the light, and for eight years sat at his feet. Returning to Neo-Cæsarea (*c.* 240), he found only seventeen Christians in the whole neighborhood. By his zealous labors, continued through thirty years, he so transformed this pagan region as to merit the title "Thaumaturgus" (wonder-worker).

His most important extant writing is his "Panegyric" on Origen. It is not only one of the most eloquent discourses in all the literature of the age, but it gives us a view of the character of Origen and his methods of teaching and of bringing his influence to bear upon young men, that we should not otherwise have possessed.

Besides the "Panegyric," we have from Gregory a "Declaration of Faith," in which the relations of the persons of the Godhead are set forth in Origenistic fashion; a "Metaphrase of the Book of Ecclesiastes," which consists chiefly of moral reflections and does not, as might have been expected of a disciple of Origen, contain an elaborate allegorical interpretation of the book; and a "Canonical Epistle," giving directions for the penance and the discipline of those who when taken captive by heathen had eaten things sacrificed to idols.

Like many of his contemporaries Gregory shrank from the responsibilities of the episcopal office. He was ordained in his absence by a neighboring bishop, whose determination to thrust this dignity upon him he was aware of and whom he was studiously avoiding. Early tradition ascribed actual miracle-working to Gregory.

(4) *Dionysius of Alexandria.*

LITERATURE: Text in "Migne," Vol. X., p. 1237, *seq.* (Eng. tr. "Ante-Nic. Lib.," Am. ed., Vol. VI., p. 81, *seq.*); works of Harnack, Seeberg, Loofs, Thomasius, Baur, and Fisher, on the history of doctrine; Dorner, "Person of Christ"; articles in "Dict. of Chr. Biog.," Herzog-Hauck, third ed., and Schaff-Herzog.

Dionysius of Alexandria (*c.* 200–265) was another distinguished pupil of Origen, and after a considerable interval (during which Heraclas conducted the work), succeeded him as head of the catechetical school of Alexandria (*c.* 232). The reputation of the school was well sustained by this great teacher, who after fifteen years of service exchanged this position for the bishopric of Alexandria (*c.* 246), succeeding Heraclas in this position also. The fragments of his works that have been preserved are chiefly polemical and exegetical. He wrote against Sabellianism, and he set forth in an epistle to Dionysius, bishop of the Roman church, his views on the Trinity. He insisted on the absolute eternity of the Son, regarding the generative process as an eternal one. Yet he held that "the Son has existence not from himself, but from the Father." This involves the subordination of the Son, which Dionysius did not know how to avoid. Controversies that were to occupy much of the energy of the Christian churches for the following centuries were already disturbing the minds of thinking men and the harmony of the churches.

(5) *The Ecclesiastical Constitutions and Canons of the Apostles.*

LITERATURE: Schaff, "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," p. 127, *seq.*, and 237, *seq.* (Schaff gives full information regarding the literature and the Greek text with an English translation); Harnack, "*Texte u. Untersuch.*," *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 225, *seq.*; Shaw, art. "Apost. Const.," in "Dict. of Chr. Antiq."; and Achelis, art. "*Apostol Kirchenordnung*," in Herzog-Hauck, third ed. In his "Hyppolytus and His Age," Vol. II., Bunsen has attempted by a critical process to restore from the Greek, Coptic, and Ethiopic texts the "Church- and House-Book of the Ancient Christians," in an English translation. It is highly probable that most of the material thus selected is Ante-Nicene.

The "Ecclesiastical Constitutions and Canons of the Apostles" seems to have formed a connecting link between the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" and the "Apostolic Constitutions," which did not reach their present form until the latter part of the fourth or the early part of the fifth century. That it was widely used is evident from the fact that it has been preserved in Greek, Ethiopic, Coptic (Memphitic and Thebaic), and Syriac.

The document known as the "Two Ways," which we have met in Barnabas and in the "Teaching," is here distributed among the twelve apostles, who are supposed to have come together to frame a body of moral instructions and who each in turn gives utterance to his thoughts. Martha and Mary also appear as speakers. The precepts as given in the "Teaching," are considerably expanded, much new material being introduced. The first thirteen canons are parallel with the "Two Ways."

The remaining seventeen canons give directions as to the qualifications, the manner of choosing and setting apart, and the duties of the various classes of church officers. A somewhat primitive ecclesiastical condition is still presupposed. If as many as twelve believing men are in a given locality, they are to write to the churches round about requesting each to send three chosen men to examine him whom they have chosen for a bishop, and if he is found worthy, to set him apart for his work. The bishop thus appointed shall examine and ordain two or three presbyters to assist in the administration of the ordinances and discipline. Provision is made for the appointment of readers, widows, deacons, and deaconesses.

The Coptic Constitutions give detailed directions respecting the selection, training, baptizing, and admission to communion, of catechumens. The utmost care is prescribed in the reception of candidates for catechetical training, those engaged in disreputable pursuits being rigorously excluded. Three years is given as the normal period of training in doctrine and in life, and admission to baptism at the end of the period is conditioned on a favorable report of the catechist as regards the candidate's good behavior, his zeal in Christian service, and his progress in Christian knowledge. Baptism is preceded by exorcism, and anointing with the oil of exorcism. The candidate goes unclothed into the water, makes an oral profession of his faith, is immersed three times, makes another fuller confession, then having gone up out of the water is anointed by the presbyter with the oil of thanksgiving, clothed, and allowed to enter the church. The bishop then lays his hands upon the head of the newly baptized, invokes the gift of the Holy Spirit, and again anoints his head. The Lord's Supper is next administered to the new members, and they are given, besides the bread and the wine, "milk and honey mixed," as symbolizing the fact that they have entered into a state of blessedness among the saints.

CHAPTER IV

CONDITION OF CHRISTIANITY AT CLOSE OF THE PERIOD

I. EXTERNAL CONDITION.

1. *Extent.* Christianity had by this time permeated the entire Roman Empire, having gained adherents even among conquered tribes. From Britain to India the name of Christ was honored. All the countries bordering on the Mediterranean Sea abounded in Christians. We are not to infer from the fact that Constantine thought it good policy to make Christianity the favored religion, that Christians were already in a majority. Even in the large cities they still constituted but a small minority, and many rural districts were still in pagan darkness. But Christianity was organized, confident, and aggressive, and to it the future evidently belonged. Paganism, on the other hand, was without organization, without hope, without aggressiveness.

2. *Social Position.* Christianity had gained a high social position in the empire. Before the Diocletian persecution Christians held many high civil offices.

3. *Wealth.* Christians by this time probably had their full share of worldly goods; the churches had, in many instances, acquired great wealth; and this individual and corporate wealth tended at the same time to give them respectability in the eyes of the world, and to facilitate the making of converts.

4. *Culture.* Christianity had now on its side culture superior to that of the pagans. There was no pagan philosopher or poet of the third century who bore comparison with the best Christian writers. Apart from the great teachers and writers, whose works we have examined, there must have been a very large number of educated Christians in each important community. The development of a rich literature presupposes a public to whose needs it is adapted.

5. *Opponents.* Yet Christianity still had many deadly

enemies: philosophers, especially the Neo-Platonists, who attempted to make of their philosophy a rival religion; priests and magicians, whose worldly interests were endangered by the growing power of Christianity; the Manichæans, etc. The widely diffused Mithras worship does not appear to have been so distinctly hostile to Christianity as Neo-Platonism and Manichæism; and many converts were doubtless drawn from this quarter.

II. INTERNAL CONDITION.

1. *Corrupting Ideas.* That Christianity did not win for itself popular and imperial recognition without undergoing momentous internal changes is admitted by all. In life, doctrine, church order, and worship, the churches of 313 were very different from the churches of 100. Those who regard the apostolic churches as a standard must look upon these changes as perversions. The following corrupting ideas, derived almost wholly from paganism, may be distinguished:

(1) *Meritoriousness of External Works.* This led to, *a.* Asceticism and fanatical seeking for martyrdom. *b.* Perversion of Christian charity into indiscriminate almsgiving, with the idea that almsgiving secured the remission of sins. *c.* Perversion of the ordinances into magical mysteries whereby spiritual benefits are obtained.

(2) *Fetichism*, the idea of the sanctity and the spiritual potency of water, the element of baptism, of holy places, of the bones and other relics of saints and martyrs, of the cross and the sign of the cross, of the sepulchre of Christ, etc.

(3) *Sacerdotalism*, common to all pagan religions, and closely connected with (1): *a.* The ordinances possessing magical efficacy must be administered by a properly qualified priest. *b.* The priest, by reason of his ceremonial consecration, a mediator between God and man, the channel through which alone the ordinary believer can secure spiritual benefits. *c.* The following of priestly directions more important than morality.

(4) *Ritualism*, an invariable accompaniment of (1) and (3). Pompous ceremonial satisfies the desire to propitiate Deity by external performances and is at the

same time the ready device of priestcraft for securing and maintaining the reverence of the people.

(5) *The Allegorical Interpretation of Scripture*, by virtue of which Scripture could be used in support of any doctrine or practice whatsoever. Nothing so completely destroys the authority of Scripture as a standard of faith and practice as this method of interpretation, which had long been in vogue among pagans and Alexandrian Jews.

These corrupting ideas had not at the close of this period fully accomplished their work; but their growing influence can already be clearly seen.

2. *Changes in the Ministry*. At the beginning of the period we had only two classes of church officers: presbyters or bishops and deacons. Now we find not only a clear distinction established between presbyters and bishops, but also the addition of a number of subordinate officers, viz., sub-deacons, readers, acolytes, janitors, and exorcists. The multiplication of officers originated in large churches, such as those of Rome, Alexandria, and Carthage. The number of deacons was usually limited to seven, in accordance with the number of brethren appointed to administer the charities under the direction of the apostles (Acts 6), and these required assistance in the performance of their functions.

The hierarchical spirit was active. The same tendencies and circumstances that raised the *bishops* above the presbyters, raised presbyters, as being entrusted with the ordinances, far above deacons and laymen. *Presbyters* continued to be the advisers of the bishops, and from their number bishops were usually chosen.

Deacons, as being limited in number and as holding an office instituted by the apostles, were, in accordance with the same hierarchical tendency, elevated in rank above laymen. Their duties consisted chiefly in the collection and administration of the finances of the churches under the direction of the bishops, and in assisting the bishops in the exercise of discipline. They attended also to the preservation of order during religious services, and assisted in the celebration of the Lord's Supper and in the administration of baptism; but they were not permitted to administer either ordinance alone.

Deaconesses, apparently recognized in the New Testament, reappear in the churches of this period. Their functions were prayer, and ministering to the religious and the temporary needs of women. They were rigorously excluded from service "at the altar."

The *sub-deacons* were not ordained with the imposition of hands, and their duties were chiefly to relieve the deacons of their humbler duties. They also usually acted as carriers of ecclesiastical correspondence.

The office of the *acolyte* was to light the candles in the church, to provide wine in the pitcher for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, etc. Such were the liturgical services of the acolytes, but doubtless they attended to many minor matters in the administration of the diocese.

The duties of the *readers* was to read the Scriptures from the reading desk. Very few Christians had copies of the Scriptures, and the great mass of the people were dependent upon hearing them read at church.

Exorcists were those supposed to be especially gifted with the power of casting out demons. These do not seem to have been a distinct class of officers especially ordained for this purpose; but the power might belong to one occupying any ecclesiastical position, or even to an unofficial member.

The reason for the multiplication of ecclesiastical offices was the necessity of having responsible functionaries, and the sacerdotal feeling which would allow laymen to perform no ecclesiastical functions.

The hierarchical development at which Cyprian aimed, and which he in a measure effected, represents the highest attainment in this direction during the period under consideration. In the cities the position of bishops was one of much dignity and responsibility. They had almost exclusive control of the church funds, including the responsible administration of the charities. They had the supervision of a large number of congregations, and of the presbyters and deacons who ministered therein. Their authority was as yet only a moral authority, but in many cases it was very considerable. Country bishops were mere pastors of local churches until long after the close of this period.

3. *Synods or Councils.* As early as the middle of the second century we have evidence of the meeting together of the clergy of different communities to consider questions affecting the interests of the churches. The earliest meetings of this sort on record are those in Asia

Minor, to take measures against Montanism, and those in 2 the East and the West to discuss the Easter question (latter part of second century).[1] As diocesan episcopacy became developed the clergy of the diocese were called together annually, or oftener in case of emergency. 3 Before the close of this period provincial synods, in which many bishops, presbyters, and deacons participated, were becoming common. Such bodies discussed and legislated upon questions of doctrine and discipline; yet their decisions had only a moral authority, and the 325 individual communities were free to accept them or not. "Within the limits of his own community," writes Hatch,[2] "a bishop has no superior but God." Cyprian, who did so much for the development of episcopal prerogative, and who laid great stress on ecclesiastical unity, refused to be bound by the decisions of councils of bishops. It was not until the next period, when councils were called under the imperial authority and when their decisions received the importance of imperial ordinances, that these latter became obligatory upon the churches.

4. *Places of Worship and Sepulture.* Until the latter part of the second century the position of Christians was not secure enough to allow of the erection of church buildings. Meetings were still held secretly in private houses. During the third century many "Lord's houses" or "churches" were erected, and considerable attention was given, in the wealthier communities, to architecture and to internal decoration.

The catacombs were underground burial places, some of which may have originated in the apostolic age. During the second and third centuries such cities of the dead were constructed at Rome, Naples, Milan, Alexandria, and elsewhere. Those of Rome and Naples are of great extent and special interest. The idea that they were largely used for purposes of worship has been abandoned, owing to lack of evidence of the existence of chambers large enough to accommodate any considerable gathering. Burial services were no doubt conducted with much solemnity, and Christians frequently visited the tombs of relatives and of venerated martyrs and other saints for devotional exercises. In times of severe persecution (which were infrequent) Christians no doubt hid themselves temporarily in these subterranean galleries. Archæologists are still undecided as regards the dates of many of the mural paintings and the inscriptions. Very few belong indisputably to this period. Most of the decoration seems to belong to the latter part of the fourth century, when the use of the catacombs for sepulture had almost ceased. As the tombs of saints and martyrs they were venerated and filled with religious paintings and inscriptions.[1]

---

[1] Eusebius, "Ch. Hist.," Bk. V., Chap. 16 and 24.

[2] "The Organization of the Early Christian Churches," p. 171.

5. *Ritualistic Development.* The externalizing tendency that we have so frequently observed in our study of this period was soon to express itself in the public worship of the churches. Under various influences: that of paganism, with its mysterious rites, especially those of the widely prevalent Mithras worship; that of Gnosticism, which itself imitated the Orphic, Eleusinian, and Pythagorean mysteries; that of being long obliged to worship secretly; and the growth of sacerdotalism, with which ritualism always goes hand in hand, Christianity, by the close of this period, had ceased to worship and perform its ordinances in the free and simple way represented in the New Testament and in the "Apology" of Justin Martyr.

From the middle of the second century onward the Lord's Prayer seems to have been generally employed in the churches in a liturgical way. Gradually other forms were added, and by the close of this period somewhat elaborate forms of prayer and praise, with full directions for the solemn administration of the ordinances, had been introduced.

There was at first no effort made at uniformity of ritual. Each great church, in general, formed a ritual of its own, and this was usually adopted by the churches under its influence. Hence the number and the variety of early liturgies.

6. *Christian Education.* In the apostolic age, when most of the converts were Jews or had been under the

---

[1] See the well-known works of Rossi, Kraus, Northcote and Brownlow, and Parker, on the Catacombs, and articles in the encyclopedias.

influence of Judaism, and hence were familiar with the Old Testament teaching, baptism was usually administered immediately after the profession of faith in Christ. When most of those who applied for admission into the churches were pagans, and had but inadequate ideas of the true God and of the Christian religion and morality, it was natural and right that they should be instructed in the fundamental truths of Christianity before baptism and full reception into the churches. During the second century the work of teaching such applicants for membership was, in the larger churches, entrusted to a catechist. In the Alexandrian school the catechumens were divided into classes according to their advancement. The period of catechising frequently extended over three years, but was in many instances much shorter. The catechumen was first instructed in simple moral principles; afterward he was admitted to hear the gospel, but was dismissed before the prayer, and especially prevented from witnessing the celebration of the ordinances. Baptism was finally administered with considerable pomp and ceremony, and the catechumen was thereby received into full fellowship.

Reference has been made in an earlier chapter to the catechetical school of Alexandria, founded by Pantænus and made illustrious by Clement, Origen, Heraclas, and Dionysius. Antioch did not so early become a seat of Christian learning, but from *c.* 270 onward, under Lucian, it came into rivalry with Alexandria as a center of theological thought and influence. In the great christological controversies of the fourth and following centuries Alexandria and Antioch were always antagonists, Alexandria representing a mystical transcendentalism and promoting the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures; Antioch insisting on the grammatico-historical interpretation of the Scriptures, and having no sympathy with mystical modes of thought.

7. *Christian Life.* We can probably get a better view of the state of Christian life at the beginning of the fourth century, by an examination of the so-called "Canons of the Holy Apostles," which may have taken their present form toward the close of this period, and of the decrees of the Councils of Elvira (306), of Arles, Ancyra, and Neo-Cæsarea (314), than in any other way. These documents show:

(1) A great amount of worldliness among the clergy

Provisions constantly occur against their engaging in secular pursuits; against their frequenting taverns and playing at dice; against usury; against their removing from place to place without sufficient reason; against their receiving their offices through secular influence, etc.

(2) It appears that many had come into the churches who were still essentially pagans. Provisions against pagan practices are common.

(3) The most prevalent and crying sin of the age seems to have been licentiousness. It must have been common among all classes of Christians, including bishops, presbyters, deacons, and nuns. A large proportion of the decrees of the councils of this period are directed against some form of sexual sin.

(4) While celibacy of the clergy was not insisted upon, a strong effort was being made to prevent those that came into the clergy unmarried, from marrying. This feeling was promoted: *a*. By the Gnostic or Manichæan idea of the inherent evil of the sexual relations. *b*. By the fact that the priesthood was coming to be looked upon as a distinct class, and that such familiar intercourse with ordinary mortals as the family involves was felt to be incompatible with priestly dignity. *c*. The fact that the clergy had complete control of the church finances made it seem undesirable for them to have dependent families.

(5) Christianity had already received far more pagan material than it could assimilate, and had become corrupted thereby, before the Diocletian persecution. When the churches had become predominatingly pagan; when pagans of wealth and influence entered the churches in large numbers, especially when they became bishops, as was often the case, it was perfectly natural that the churches should be made to conform to a great extent to pagan temples; should be filled with images; should introduce saint-worship in the place of polytheism, etc.

(6) Yet we must beware of supposing that Christianity as a whole was thus corrupt. That there were many who abhorred the prevalent laxity of morals and who earnestly strove for reformation, is evident from the very existence of the documents on which we are dependent for our knowledge of the facts mentioned. Moreover,

the prevalence of laxity was the cause of much of the extreme asceticism that appeared in the church from the time of Tertullian onward.

8. *Multiplication of Ecclesiastical Festivals*. At the beginning, the Lord's Day and the Jewish Sabbath were, so far as we know, the only days to which Christians attached any particular sanctity.

(1) *Easter* may, in some sense, have been observed in the apostolic age, *i. e.*, the Jewish Passover continued for a time to be observed by Jewish Christians, the chief thought in their minds being probably the death and resurrection of Christ. Gradually this came to be the only thought. We have seen how from the time of Polycarp, controversy raged with regard to the exact time of its celebration.

The fact that vernal festivals were general among pagan peoples no doubt had much to do with the form assumed by the Easter festival in the Christian churches. The English term "Easter" is of pagan origin.

(2) So also the feast of *Pentecost* was connected with the Jewish feast, the Jewish element soon dropping out of consideration, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit coming to be exclusively thought of.

(3) The feast of *Epiphany* probably originated in the second century, and was designed as a commemoration of the baptism of Christ, when he was manifested to the world as the Son of God. It was celebrated on January 6. At a very early date the idea of the nativity was added to that of baptism, both being commemorated on this day. It was not until about the middle of the fourth century that the birthday and the baptismal day were separated, the former being placed on December 25, the date of the Roman *Brumalia* at the close of the *Saturnalia* (December 17–24), and of the Scandinavian *Yule*. This date follows immediately the winter solstice, and there was thought to be a peculiar appropriateness in identifying the birthday of the Sun of Righteousness with that of the physical sun.[1]

(4) In connection with these festivals, long periods of

---

[1] *Cf.* Conybeare "The History of Christmas," in the "American Journal of Theology," for January, 1899.

fasting were observed by Montanists and other ascetical Christians.

(5) Martyrs have already come to be venerated, but there is no evidence that their festivals were definitely established before the fourth century.

9. *The Rule of Faith.* We have observed, in our study of the writings of Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen, that in opposition to heresy there grew up in the churches a clear, concise confession of faith, which tended more and more to become stereotyped into a creed. At a later period the process was completed by attributing the fully developed creed to the apostles. This brief statement was early used as a baptismal confession. (See the "rule of faith," in its gradual growth from the apostolic age to the fourth century, in Schaff, "Creeds of Christendom," Vol. II., pp. 11–55.)

10. *The New Testament Canon.* Until after the middle of the second century there was no such thing as a definite New Testament canon. The Old Testament books, chiefly in the Septuagint version and without the exclusion of the Apocrypha, were chiefly appealed to as authoritative. The New Testament books were freely used for substance of doctrine, but rarely quoted with precision. Evidence of the use of all the New Testament books by *c.* 150 has been preserved. Marcion, the Gnostic (*c.* 140), seems to have been the first to form a definite New Testament canon; but this was a distinctly subjective and partisan selection, consisting of one Gospel only (a modification of Luke) and ten Pauline Epistles (including the Epistle to the Laodiceans). Tatian, another Gnostic, constructed a combination Gospel (Diatessaron), probably in the interests of his peculiar views, though it may have been prepared before his separation from the orthodox communion. The Muratorian Fragment (after 150), a document of unknown authorship, gives a list of fully received New Testament writings from which Hebrews, James, 1 and 2 Peter, and 3 John are definitely excluded, doubt being expressed about 2 John and Jude. Irenæus (*c.* 175) quotes all of the New Testament books except Philemon, 2 Peter, and Jude, but seems to regard the "Shepherd" of Hermas as also inspired. Clement of Alexandria (*c.* 200) uses

all the canonical New Testament writings, but seems to put the Epistle of Barnabas on a level with these. Origen (*c.* 255) includes in his list all our canonical books except James and Jude, and along with these Hermas, Barnabas, and 1 Clement. The Peshito Syriac version (*c.* 300) omits 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation. It was not till after the close of this period that perfect definiteness was reached; for in Eusebius' time (*c.* 325) the canonical authority of James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Revelation, while upheld by many, was disputed by some.

In conflict with heresy the Christian leaders were led to emphasize more and more the importance of apostolic teaching as the basis of doctrine and the common bond that unified all true Christian churches. As the authoritative exponents of apostolic teaching, the apostolic writings grew in importance. As a consciousness of church unity and a realization of the necessity of uniformity in doctrine and practice grew, the importance of agreement with reference to the body of apostolic writings that should be held as authoritative came to be profoundly felt. Such writings as had been held in suspicion on account of supposed peculiarities of teaching were gradually received into favor, and attention was given to harmonizing seeming discrepancies.

Thus we see that the formation of the New Testament canon was the work of centuries. From the human point of view we may say that the selection of books that should form the canon was a product of Christian consciousness; from the divine point of view we may say that this process was presided over and directed by the Holy Spirit.[1]

---

[1] See the great works of Westcott and Zahn on the New Testament canon.

N. T. came into existence because
of local conditions
that made church decide on canon
of writings (among them apocrypha
1. great no. of [illegible] Who still held what
2. Heresy in church as orthodox
3. Montanism. Spirit of prophecy
4. [illegible]

PERIOD III

FROM THE CONVERSION OF CONSTANTINE TO THE CORONATION OF CHARLEMAGNE (312–800)

-305-

CHAPTER I

CHURCH AND STATE

LITERATURE: Eutropius, "*Breviarium Hist. Rom.*," Bk. IX., X.; Lactantius, "*De Mort. Persecutorum*"; Eusebius, "*H. E.*," Bk. IX., X., and "*De Vita Constantini*" (Eusebius was a thorough courtier, and his praises of Constantine are to be taken with much allowance); Laws of Constantine in the codes of Theodosius and Justinian, also arranged in Migne's "Patrology" under the title, "*Opera Constantini*"; Socrates, "*H. E.*," Bk. I.; Sozomen, "*H. E.*," Bk. I., II. (Several of these works are available in English in the "Ante-Nicene" and the "Nicene and Post-Nicene Libraries" of the Fathers); Neander, Vol. II., pp. 1–32, and *passim*; Schaff, Vol. II., pp. 1–37; Stanley, "Eastern Church," *passim*; Neale, "The Holy Eastern Church," *passim*; Newman, "Arians of the Fourth Century"; Milman, "Latin Christianity," Vol. I., pp. 93, *seq.*; Gibbon, "Dec. and Fall," Chap. 15–17; Greenwood, "*Cathedra Petri*," Bk. I., Chap. 7, 8; Alzog, "Univ. Ch. Hist.," Vol. I., § 96, *seq.*; De Broglie, "*L'Eglise et l'Empire au IV. Siècle*," Vol. I., II.; Keim, "*Der Uebertritt Const. d. Gr.*"; Tozer, "The Church and the Eastern Empire"; Carr, "The Church and the Roman Empire"; Gwatkin, "The Arian Controversy"; Zahn, "*Constantin d. Grosse u. d. Kirche*"; Brieger, "*Konstantin d. Gr. als Religionspolitiker*"; Neander, "*Kaiser Julian u. s. Zeitalter*"; Rendall, "The Emp. Julian: Paganism and Christianity"; Cutts, "Constantine the Great"; King, "Julian the Emperor"; Tzschirner, "*D. Fall d. Heidenthums*"; art. on the various emperors, events, and institutions in Smith and Wace and Herzog-Hauck.

I. CONSTANTINE AND HIS SUCCESSORS.

1. *Constantine's Motives in Adopting Christianity.* Constantine, like his father, was out of sympathy with the popular religion and was interested in the worship of the Persian sun-god Mithras, then much in vogue in the Roman army. It was a combination of Neo-Platonic with Zoroastrian modes of thought, and was made attractive by an elaborate and imposing ritual. When about to lead his forces against the tyrant Maxentius at the Milvian bridge near Rome he felt that the occasion was a most critical one. Success meant ultimate headship of the empire. Defeat would be utterly disastrous. He

was aware of the fact that Maxentius had exhausted all the possibilities in the way of propitiating the popular deities, and he could not hope to compete with him for their support. He had been brought up to regard Christianity with some degree of favor. He had observed its aggressiveness, its rapid growth, and its thorough organization. In his anxiety he made up his mind to invoke the aid of the God of the Christians. Something must be done to inspire his troops with confidence. He declared that he had seen in the sky a banner in the form of a cross with the inscription "By this conquer." He had a splendid labarum made after the pattern of what he claimed to have seen, and under this banner his army won a glorious victory.

Constantine's subsequent life was not such as to lead us to credit his account of the divine manifestation. He was a shrewd and unscrupulous politician. No life was sacred if his interests seemed to require its destruction. He had Licinius treacherously slain after his defeat. The murder of nearly all his relatives, including his nephew Licinianus and his son Crispus, seems wholly unjustifiable and could not have been the work of a Christian. The story of the murder of his wife Fausta has been somewhat discredited. In general, it may be said, that while his character compares favorably with that of pagan despots, and had many admirable and amiable traits, he can hardly be supposed to have exercised a saving faith.

2. *Constantine's Favors to Christianity.* Soon after the victory over Maxentius he had a statue of himself erected in Rome with a cross in the right hand and the inscription, "By virtue of this salutary sign, which is the true symbol of valor, I have preserved and liberated your city from the yoke of tyranny," etc. The Edict of Milan (313), issued jointly by Constantine and Licinius, proclaimed liberty of conscience and showed partiality for Christianity. His policy at first was not to interfere with pagan worship, but by filling the chief offices with Christians and surrounding himself with Christian teachers to make the condition of Christians enviable. Pagan temples that were peculiarly offensive to Christians on account of their immoral rites, or to which pilgrimages were made from superstitious motives, were in some cases destroyed.

He exempted the Christian clergy from military and municipal duties and their property from taxation (313); abolished various pagan customs and ordinances offensive to Christians (315); facilitated the emancipation of Christian slaves (315); legalized bequests to Christian churches, a very important measure (321); enjoined the civil observance of Sunday, though only as the day of the Sun, and in connection with an ordinance requiring the consultation of the soothsayer (321); contributed largely toward the building of Christian houses of worship; and gave his sons a Christian education.

In 324 he is said to have promised to every convert to Christianity twenty pieces of gold and a white baptismal robe, and twelve thousand men, with women and children in proportion, are said to have been baptized in Rome in one year. The persistent adherence of the Roman aristocracy to paganism was a matter of great concern to Constantine, and he took especial pains to overcome the antipathy of the Romans toward Christianity.

In 325 he issued a general exhortation to his subjects to embrace Christianity.

3. *Constantine's View of the Relations of Church and State.* As the Roman emperor was Pontifex Maximus of the pagan State religion, he would naturally assume the same relation to Christianity when it became predominant. This headship the gratitude of the Christians heartily accorded. In all of his dealings with Christian matters the supreme motive seems to have been that of securing unity. About doctrinal differences he was almost indifferent. But he dreaded dissension among those on whom he depended for the support of his government. Catholic

He attempted to settle the Donatist controversy by negotiation and arbitration, and resorted to violence only when all other means had proved ineffective.

At great expense he convened the Nicene Council for the adjudication of the controversy between Arius and Alexander. His persecution of Arianism was due to his conviction that only thus ecclesiastical unity could be restored. He soon came under the influence of semi-Arian bishops (Eusebius, etc.), and the year before his death he banished Athanasius, who had become bishop of Alexandria. Constantine did not formally adopt

Christianity as the religion of the State, but he virtually gave it this position.

Though he considered himself a "bishop of bishops," he did not think it prudent to accept baptism until just before his death in 337. No doubt this delay was due to his belief in the efficacy of baptism to wash away the sins and crimes that had so marred his life.

When the Roman people refused to accept the new religion, Constantine transferred his capital to Byzantium and built Constantinople or New Rome. Other reasons doubtless co-operated with his desire for a Christian capital.

4. *The Sons of Constantine*. Constantine's three sons, Constantine II. (b. 312), Constantius II. (b. 317), and Constans (b. 320), succeeded to the imperial dignity with the good will of the armies. The other relatives of Constantine, except two nephews, Julian and Gallus, were foully massacred, Constantius being chiefly responsible for the crime. The empire was so divided that Constantine II. ruled in the West, Constans in Italy and Africa, and Constantius II. in the East. Constantine was slain in a battle with Constans near the walls of Aquileia (340). Constans was forced to commit suicide by one of his generals (350). This left Constantius sole emperor. The sons of Constantine did little credit to their Christian education and profession.

Constantius went far beyond his father in his efforts to destroy paganism, which still determinedly held its ground in Rome, Alexandria, and in many other parts of the empire. In 341 a law was promulgated against pagan superstition and sacrifice. In 346 the visiting of temples was forbidden. In 352 and 356 the death penalty was affixed to heathen sacrifices and to conversion to Judaism. These laws could not be enforced in Rome or in Alexandria. Constantius regarded his pagan opponents as traitors and pagan rites as involving conspiracy. Constantine II. and Constans favored the orthodox or Athanasian party and restored Athanasius repeatedly to his See. Constantius was an Arian and joined with Athanasius' opponents in repeatedly banishing him. The growing corruption and intolerance of Christians and the irritating and arbitrary measures of Constantius prepared the way for the pagan reaction that was to follow this reign.

5. *Julian the Apostate.* Julian and his elder half-brother, Gallus, nephews of Constantine the Great, were saved, through the intercession of a bishop, from the common massacre of relatives, the one by reason of his tender youth, the other because of supposed mortal sickness. Julian received a Christian education under the direction of Bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia, and during his residence in Cappadocia he is said to have ministered in the churches, probably as reader. He studied classical literature in Constantinople and in Nicomedia, where the great rhetorician Libanius was teaching. Forbidden to attend the lectures of this pagan master he secretly read his writings and became deeply interested in the Neo-Platonic philosophy, with its mysteries and its manticism. The fact that pagan philosophy and life were forbidden fruit no doubt whetted his appetite. He secured initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries, and while remaining outwardly a Christian was really an enthusiastic pagan

In 356 he was made a Cæsar by Constantius, and soon won renown as a general in the Gallic wars. Jealous of his popularity Constantius sought to recall a large part of his army. The troops refused to leave their general and proclaimed him Augustus. He now declared his hostility to Christianity and was zealous in reopening and rehabilitating the heathen temples that had been closed by Constantius. Constantius died in Cilicia just as Julian was approaching Constantinople. His cause was won without a battle.

He proceeded at once to restore the temples and their sacrificial services and to reinstate the mystagogues and priests in all their ancient privileges, and withdrew from the Christian clergy the privileges and immunities that had been conferred upon them by Constantine and his sons. He borrowed from Christianity whatever he thought likely to add to the attractiveness of the pagan public services (popular preaching by purple-robed priests, music, hymnology, etc.). He prohibited Christians from teaching classical literature, wishing no doubt to reduce Christianity to a despised and illiterate sect. To discredit the Christian prophecies regarding the destruction of Jerusalem and to encourage the inveterate enemies of Christianity, he attempted to restore the Jewish temple at Jerusalem. He favored Donatists and Arians in comparison with Catholics.

It does not appear to have been Julian's intention to persecute Christians; but the collisions that occurred between the Christians and the officials in the restoration to pagan purposes of property long used for Christian purposes, the rigorous enforcement of pagan practices in the army, and the necessity of punishing deeds of outlawry committed, or supposed to have been committed, by Christians, involved much hardship that could scarcely be distinguished from persecution.

After reigning less than two years Julian was slain in battle with the Persians. It is by no means certain that after receiving the mortal spear-thrust he cried out: "Galilean, thou hast conquered."

Christianity was tried, but not cast down, by this short-lived attempt to galvanize into life moribund paganism.[1]

6. *Theodosius the Great* (378–395). The immediate successors of Julian did little more than remove the restrictions that had been placed upon the progress of Christianity and gradually restore to the churches the privileges they had enjoyed under Constantine and his sons. Gratian (375–383) refused the title of Pontifex Maximus, prohibited the superstitious consulting of victims, abolished the privileges of the vestal virgins, had the much-prized altar of Victory removed from its place near the Curia of the Senate, and sought in every way to break the power of Roman paganism. These measures were carried out under the advice of the great soldier and statesman Theodosius, who became joint-emperor with Gratian (378) and sole emperor (394).

Theodosius is commonly regarded as the first orthodox emperor and the first to make orthodox Christianity the exclusive religion of the State. He secured from the Roman Senate an acknowledgment that the religion of Christ was true. He prohibited sacrifices and even visits to pagan temples, prostration before idols, the worship of household gods, and all other idolatrous practices.

---

[1] For Julian's own statement of his philosophical and religious views, see his works, ed. Hertlein, Leipzig, 1875–76.

Theodosius died soon afterward and divine honors were paid to him by the still pagan Romans in the usual style. Many pagan temples were destroyed at this time by fanatical bands of Christians, with the approval of bishops and emperor. The desecration of the temple of Serapis in Alexandria so infuriated the pagans of the city that a massacre of Christians resulted. The temple was destroyed by imperial command, and the famous idol, on whose preservation the rising of the Nile was supposed to depend, was smitten down. The Nile is said to have risen higher than usual that year.

Lactantius in the time of Constantine wrote: "Religion cannot be compelled; nothing is so voluntary as religion." Ambrose and Augustine now advocated the forcible suppression of paganism and heresy. Many bishops led their people in their violent onslaughts on pagan sanctuaries and did not shrink even from bloodshed in the accomplishment of their purposes. Paganism made a desperate struggle for existence, but it did not possess the religious enthusiasm that enabled early Christianity to survive persecution. It had its revenge in the almost complete paganization of the churches that speedily followed the enforced conversion of its unwilling adherents.

II. THE STATE CHURCH.

While it is undeniable that great evil resulted to Christianity from its adoption by the State, we must not close our eyes to the (temporarily) beneficent results of this adoption.

That Christianity should become predominant was, of course, highly desirable. We may say that it ought to have spread its influence by purely spiritual means, until its teachings should have pervaded society in all its elements; that the State ought to have become Christian, but that it ought to have manifested its Christianity simply by putting into practice the spirit of Christianity. But while such is our ideal, we could scarcely expect the Christians of the fourth century to foresee what we, with the experience of more than fifteen hundred years of the effects of State patronage and control of religion, are just beginning to see.

1. *Beneficent Results of the Adoption of Christianity as the State Religion.*

(1) An immensely larger number of people was thus brought somewhat under the influence of Christianity than would otherwise have been possible. That men were induced to abandon idolatry and attach themselves even outwardly to Christianity was, in a sense, a gain.

(2) Christianity had a much more direct and powerful effect upon the legislation of the Roman empire than would otherwise have been possible. The most fundamental thing in the Roman political system was the all-importance of the State and consequent indifference to the rights of the individual. Christianity gave to legislation a high sense of the value of human life; of the rights of all human beings, slaves, foreigners, and barbarians included. We have ample proof of the beneficent effect of Christianity on Roman legislation in the Theodosian Code (424–438), which contains the legislation of Constantine and his successors; and in the Justinian Code, which contains the legislation from Hadrian to Justinian (527).

The position of women was greatly elevated. Constantine gave to women the right to control their own property. Marriage was made free by the abolition of the old penalties against celibacy and childlessness. Marriage of near relations was restricted; divorce was rendered difficult.

Concubinage was forbidden, and adultery was punished as one of the greatest of crimes. The absolute power of parents over children, extending to freedom and life, was abolished, and child murder was rendered criminal.

While slavery was still allowed, its evils were lessened, and the manumission of slaves was encouraged.

Gladiatorial shows, against which Christians had striven from the beginning of the second century, were gradually and partially abolished.

(3) Christianity exerted a beneficent effect on morality. This is involved in its influence on legislation. The tone of morals could, of course, be raised only very gradually; but undoubtedly the change soon became perceptible.

2. *Evils that Christianity Suffered in Consequence of the Union.*

The points in which Constantine and his followers favored Christianity may also be regarded as involving evils. When he put restrictions on idolatry, he fostered a spirit of intolerance in Christians, and led them to trust in physical power rather than in the power of the truth. When he enjoined the universal observance of Sunday, it ceased to be a spiritual, and became a legal festival. When he legalized Christian corporations,—a thing right in itself,—he presented a great temptation to Christian bishops to devote themselves largely to the enrichment of the churches, which they frequently accomplished by the most unfair means. When he offered temporal inducements to the profession of Christianity, he not only brought multitudes of unregenerate people into the churches, but he also aided in making it a part of public opinion to regard the profession of Christianity as a mere form, and to attach a magical significance to the ordinances. His efforts for church unity greatly interfered with freedom of thought, and fostered the spirit of intolerance in the favored party. The favors that he bestowed upon the bishops increased their pride and worldliness, and caused an unchristian striving for important bishoprics.

We may particularize as follows:

(1) Christianity was secularized. The doors of the church were thrown open so wide, that the distinction between Christianity and the world was obliterated.

Christian churches assumed the magnificence of heathen temples. In imitating the pomp, Christians were sure to imitate the practices of heathenism, especially as the most influential Christians were now men that had been brought up pagans, and had adopted Christianity chiefly because it was the fashion.

Many Christian preachers rebuked this worldliness most vehemently; but the example of the imperial court was more influential with the rank and file.

(2) As pagans had been accustomed to worship a host of gods and goddesses, they felt the need, after becoming Christians, of numerous objects of adoration. The most honored characters of the early apostolic and suc-

ceeding times were, of course, selected, such as Mary, the mother of Christ, the apostles, and other martyrs.

(3) As pagans had been accustomed to worship their gods under the form of images, the new converts naturally required images of the saints, and the churches were soon filled with these objects. That pagans so readily gave up their religion and embraced Christianity can be accounted for only by the fact that Christianity adapted itself so entirely to their ideas as to make the change little more than nominal.

(4) Hierarchical development was stimulated. Bishops, who had already in great measure gained supremacy over presbyters, became more uniformly and entirely supreme after the union.

The ecclesiastical hierarchy was made a counterpart of the civil government. Constantine divided the empire into four prætorian prefectures—two in the East and two in the West.

The East, with Antioch as its capital, embraced five dioceses: Syria; Egypt (capital Alexandria); Pontus (capital Cæsarea); Asia (capital Ephesus); Thrace, Hæmiontis, Moesia, and Scythia (capital Constantinople).

The Illyrian prefecture comprised Macedonia and Dacia. The Italian prefecture was divided into two vicariates: Rome (embracing Southern Italy and the Mediterranean islands); the Italian vicariate (Lombardy, and territory south of the Danube, capital Milan). To this was added Western Africa (capital Carthage) and Western Illyricum.

The fourth prefecture was Gaul (France, Spain, and Britain).

As bishops of the capitals of the provinces had for some time exercised a moral influence superior to that of bishops of less important cities, they were now endued by a decree of the Council of Nicæa, enforced by imperial power, with authority over all the bishops of their respective provinces. The bishops highest in authority were those of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, and Jerusalem. These bishoprics magnified their natural importance by their tradition of apostolic foundation, and were afterward distinguished (along with that of Constantinople) as patriarchates.

As Rome was the chief city of the West, and the seat of government for the entire West, the Council of Nicæa gave to the bishop of Rome authority over all bishops in the West (including Western Africa, Italy, Gaul, Spain, Britain, etc.); and this authority being so much more extensive than that of the other patriarchates, naturally tended to encourage the Roman bishops to the assertion of absolute supremacy over all the churches. Yet, when Constantinople became the seat of the Empire, the patriarchate of Constantinople became a rival to the Roman, although it had no apostolic origin to boast.

(5) The church became a persecuting power, making use of the civil authority for the suppression of dissent and paganism. There had been bigotry and intolerance enough before, but they had expressed themselves only morally. Now they exhibited their true character. It will not seem so strange to us that this secularized Christianity should have persecuted, if we consider the following facts:

a. The Old Testament, with the majority of Christians, was of equal authority with the New Testament, and was looked upon as containing a model of church polity. Now the Old Testament abounds in narrations in which the persecuting zeal of rulers is represented as highly pleasing to God. Special praise is accorded to those who slaughtered multitudes of heathen, and destroyed their places and objects of worship. Christian rulers felt that they were glorifying themselves and God in emulating such examples; and Christian preachers felt that they were filling the place of Old Testament prophets when they incited the rulers to the violent extermination of paganism and heresy.

b. By this time it had come to be pretty generally believed that out of the church there is no salvation. The idea of the church was limited to those who adhered to apostolic unity as represented by the dominant party. By persecution some would be brought back into the church (whether honestly or not, was a minor consideration). If some were slain, they were only made to meet their inevitable fate a little sooner. It was a question of saving some, or letting all go together to perdition. Moreover, by the slaying of the incorrigible, others would be saved from their corrupting influence, and still others would be deterred through fear of a like fate. Our Lord's injunction, "Compel them to come in," was interpreted literally, and regarded as a sanction for the employment of force, even by Augustine.

c. Alongside of these more honest grounds for persecution must be placed personal considerations. Those who were particularly annoyed by the presence of heretics or pagans, were greatly tempted to seek their extermination.

d. Add to these the political need of the unity of religious belief and practice, so strongly felt by the rulers of a great empire, and the encouragement these gave to Christian intolerance, and persecution by Christians appears as a matter of course. The church has persecuted Christians far more cruelly, and has destroyed vastly more Christians than pagans have done. The Diocletian persecution is as nothing when compared with the work of the "Holy Office."

(6) Reaction against worldliness, resulting in the excesses of asceticism. Monasticism is not peculiar to Christianity, but seems naturally to occur under favorable circumstances in connection with almost any system of religion. It existed in the most exaggerated forms among Brahmins and Buddhists long before the Christian era. The Essenes and the Therapeutæ, at and before the time of Christ, were ascetics. It is probable that Christian asceticism was historically connected with the Oriental theosophy, though not very directly or consciously derived from it.

So long as Christianity was persecuted, Christians of an ascetic turn of mind usually found opportunity enough for self-denial in enduring hardships for the faith. We see the ascetic spirit manifested in Montanists, Novatians, and Donatists, and in the multitudes that were always ready to deliver themselves to death. In Gnosticism and Manichæism it had a thoroughly perverse development.

From the true Christian idea that the flesh must be crucified and the lusts thereof, that those who would come after Christ must deny themselves, etc., Christians soon came to look upon suffering in connection with religion as meritorious in itself, and were willing to endure the greatest physical agonies for the peace of conscience thence derivable. The New Testament opposition between spirit and flesh, was laid hold of and perverted.

Now this ascetic spirit continued to exist in many after persecution had ceased. Nay, it was intensified by the increase of worldliness in the Christian churches. Such spirits came to feel that it was impossible to live a truly Christian life in the worldly churches. How was the ascetic spirit, the desire for self-sacrifice, to find vent? The ascetics withdrew from society and retired into waste places, where they spent their time in fasting and prayer, and in making the spirit triumph over the flesh. The greater the rigor of their self-discipline, the greater the merit; so endless means of self-torture were devised, which amounted, in many instances, to suicide. Insanity, in various degrees, almost always resulted from such austerities. (This refers to the earlier stages of hermit life.) We may distinguish four stages in the development of Monasticism:

a. The asceticism that prevailed in the churches themselves, varying in its austerity.

b. Hermit life or Anchoretism. This form of asceticism may have arisen about the middle of the third century, but it became common only after the union of Church and State. Jerome's romantic account of Paul of Thebes, and Antony of Alexandria, are mainly fabulous, as is also much in the life of Antony attributed to Athanasius. But these and like narratives may have had a basis of fact, and they exhibit in concrete form the ideals that prevailed in the latter half of the fourth century. The following sketch of Antony, without the fables, may be in the main correct:

> Born about 251, he became in early manhood an enthusiastic ascetic, sold his large estate, and gave the proceeds to the poor, committing his sister, whose guardian he was, to a body of virgins. He strove to detach himself from the world, and to eradicate all human sensibilities and desires. His efforts to banish evil thoughts seemed only to intensify them. In order to make his separation from the world more complete, he removed some miles from his native village, and occupied a cleft in a rock. His imagination was rendered so fervid by his austerities, that he supposed himself to be assaulted by the powers of darkness.

He then resorted to a still more secluded place, where he remained twenty years. But his fame had now spread, so that large numbers came to him for spiritual guidance, many adopting the same mode of life. He desired to escape from men, and sought a still more retired place; but he was still pursued, being reputed to possess superhuman sanctity and the power of working miracles.

Only on the rarest occasions did he visit Alexandria, as in 311, in the time of the Diocletian persecution, for the purpose of encouraging the Christians, and in 352 to counteract the spread of Arianism.

Antony's food was bread and salt, never tasted until after sunset. He often fasted entirely for two or three days. He watched and prayed all night, sleeping only a little time on the ground. He rejected the practice of bathing, and is said never to have seen himself nude. Many of his followers far surpassed Antony in self-mortification.

From Egypt hermit life spread into Syria and other parts of the empire.

c. Cœnobitic or cloister life. This too originated in Egypt, probably from the example of the Essenes and Therapeutæ. The hermits had become numerous. Here, as always, extensiveness decreased intensity. The feeling arose that the true interests of ascetics would be better subserved by association with kindred spirits. Moreover, there was a tendency for large numbers of younger hermits to flock to those who had attained to great celebrity for instruction. Such was true even in the case of Antony, and he himself was said to have encouraged the association of ascetics.

The anchoretic life was not at all adapted to females. Even in the time of Tertullian "virgins" had begun to live together at the expense of the churches.

The association of monks was at first informal. When the number became great it was necessary to adopt rules for the government of the society and to fix terms for admission.

The first rules of importance were those of Pachomius. Near the beginning of the fourth century Pachomius, a young soldier, obtained release from military service and attached himself to an old hermit, with whom he lived twelve years. He was not satisfied with a life of idle devotion, but felt a strong impulse to do good to his brethren. Accordingly he organized a society of monks on an island in the Nile, which during his lifetime reached a membership of three thousand. The entire body of monks was divided into twenty-four classes, according to the letters of the alphabet. The gradations were those of spiritual advancement. Over each class was a presiding officer, Pachomius himself being the abbot or father of all. They supported themselves by various kinds of labor: agriculture, ship-building, tanning, basket making, etc. No one had anything of his own, but all earnings went to the common treasury, from which all were supported. Particular duties were assigned to each by his superior, and special hours of devotion were appointed for all.

This form of ascetic life became popular. Multitudes of all classes of society flocked to the cloisters. Many monks, losing their first enthusiasm, were tormented in spirit and became insane. Many became vicious. Many entered the monasteries to escape military service and other hardships, which the declining empire put upon its subjects.

d. The founding of monastic orders, *i. e.*, the organization under the same ~~rule and name,~~ of monastic bodies in various regions. Under this form medieval Monasticism for the most part existed.

REMARK.—While we have here classed Monasticism in general among the evil results of the union of Church and State, we must beware of regarding it as only evil. In its favor it may be said (*a*) that it made strong resistance to worldliness; (*b*) it was a powerful means of attracting pagans to Christianity; (*c*) in many instances it promoted theological study; (*d*) it afforded a refuge and means of reformation for those that were cast out from society.

On the other hand: (*a*) it withdrew large numbers of good men from active service in Christ's cause; (*b*) it fostered spiritual pride and hypocrisy; (*c*) it filled Christendom with radically wrong ideas of religion and morality; (*d*) it brutalized many men; (*e*) it was a most influential factor in the development of hierarchy.[1]

---

[1] Literature on early Monasticism: Socrates, "*H. E.*," Bk. IV., Chap. 23; Sozomen, "*H. E.*,' Bk. I., Chap. 12-14; Palladius, "*Historia Lausiaca*"; Theodoret, '*Historia Religiosa seu Ascetica Vivendi Ratio*"; Nilus, "*De Vita Ascetica*," "*De Exercitatione Monastica*," etc.; Rufinus, "*Historia Eremitica*"; Sulpicius Severus, "*Dialogi Tres*"; Cassianus, "*Institutiones Cœnobiales*"; Athanasius, "*Vita Antonii*"; Jerome, "*Vita S. Pauli Eremitæ*," "*Vita S. Hilarionis*," "*Vita Malchi*," "*Regula S. Pachomii*," '*Adv. Jovinianum*," "*Adv. Vigilantium*," "*Epistolæ*"; Augustine, "*De Sancta Virginitate*," "*De Opere Monachorum*," "*Confessiones*," etc.; Chrysostom, "*Opera*," *passim*; Bollandus, "*Acta Sanctorum*"; Montalambert, "The Monks of the West"; Gibbon, Chap. 37; Schaff, "C. H.," Vol. II., p. 147, *seq.*, and in "*Jahrbücher f. Deutsche Theol.*," 1861; Neander, Vol. II., p. 262, *seq.*; Möhler, "*Gesch. des Mönchthums*"; I. Taylor, "Anct. Christianity"; Lea, "Sacerdotal Celibacy"; Zöckler, "*Krit. Gesch. der Askese*"; Harnack, "*Das Mönchthum, seine Idealen u. s. Geschichte*"; Weingarten, "*Ursprung d Mönchthums*"; Marin, "*Les Moines de Constantinople*," 1897.

CHAPTER II

CONTROVERSIES IN THE CHURCH

IT was doubtless hoped by many that when organized Christianity had gained power to enforce its decisions there would be an end of controversy. Yet never had controversy raged so fiercely as in the fourth and following centuries. The parties that were already in existence now came forward with a great increase of polemical energy, and new parties arose.

Persecution of the less powerful by the dominant parties was employed without scruple, but to little avail. It seems to be an established principle that persecution, if not carried to the point of extermination, and if not carried on so constantly and severely as to destroy the spirit of the persecuted, really promotes their spread.

We may divide the controversies of the period into seven classes: (1) On ecclesiastical polity; (2) on the relations of the godhead; (3) on the teaching of Origen; (4) on Christology; (5) on the doctrine of the person of Christ; (6) on anthropology; (7) controversies involving protests against the paganizing of Christianity.

I. ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY—THE DONATIST CONTROVERSY.

We left the Donatists in the other period when the schism had just been completed. A brief sketch of the efforts to heal the schism must here be given:

1. *Their Appeal to Constantine.* Constantine having expressly excepted the Donatists from the privileges conferred on Christians at the beginning of his reign, they appealed to him (then in Gaul) to name judges in that country to inquire into the nature of the divisions in Carthage (313). Constantine referred the matter to Melchiades, bishop of Rome, and five Gallic bishops, before whom the accused Cæcilian and ten African bishops from each side were summoned. A hasty decision in favor of Cæcilian resulted.

The Donatists complained that their cause had not been fully heard, and Constantine ordered a second investigation at Arles (314), expressing himself against the Donatists.

A large conference was called, to be composed of bishops of both parties from various parts of the empire. This body was packed, the great majority of the bishops being from Gaul and Italy. The decision was on the whole favorable to Cæcilian, yet it was enacted that traditors who could be proved to be such from public documents—not from mere rumor—should be removed from the ministry. The Donatists failed to prove from public documents that either Mensurius or Cæcilian or Felix of Aptunga, who had ordained Cæcilian, was a *traditor*.

The investigations conducted by the imperial commissioners had reference chiefly to the conduct of Felix, whose traditorship was supposed by the Donatists to have vitiated the ordination of Cæcilian.

From this decision the Donatists appealed to the emperor himself. He decided against them in 316, and threatened the banishment of their bishops and the confiscation of their property in case they should refuse to yield.

2. *Persecution of the Donatists.* Constantine's threat was soon executed. Donatists were deprived of their churches and harassed in various ways. This persecution had the effect of driving many of them already inclined to fanaticism to deeds of violence. In 317 Constantine exhorted the Catholics to abstain from retaliation. In 321 the Donatists sent a petition to the emperor, saying that they would submit to anything rather than affiliate with the rascally Bishop Cæcilian. Constantine thought further measures useless and granted them full liberty of conscience.

3. *Efforts of the Emperor Constans to Bribe the Donatists, and the Succeeding Persecution.* In 340 Constans made an effort, under the pretence of alms, to use money for conciliating the Donatists. The Donatist bishops were exasperated, and again there was a resort to force. They were once more deprived of their churches and their assemblies were broken up by armed troops.

Those that resisted were in many instances slain. The Donatists were now led to declare boldly their opposition to civil interference in matters of religion. This was henceforth one of the fundamental principles of the party.

4. *The Donatists and the Emperor Julian.* Julian attempted to restore paganism, and of course withdrew the privileges that had been bestowed upon the dominant form of organized Christianity by his predecessors. The Donatists appealed to him, and he issued an edict annulling whatever had been undertaken against them and restoring to them their churches.

5. *The Donatists and Augustine.* The Donatist schism was still unabated at the beginning of the fifth century. Augustine, bishop of Hippo, was impelled, not only by his high idea of church unity, but also by the annoyance that the schism caused him personally, to write against them and to seek to compass their overthrow. The leading points on which Augustine bases his attacks are:

(1) Their persistent *separation* from the church, which led them to refuse to enter even into social relations with the Catholics.

(2) Their insistence on the *rebaptism* of the Catholics as a condition of communion with them. This offered the greatest obstacle to union, necessitating a complete surrender on the part of the Catholics in order thereunto.

(3) He rebuts their charges of persecution on the part of the Catholics by setting forth the *intolerance* of Donatists themselves, citing as instances the refusal of Donatists in a town in which they were predominant to sell bread to Catholics, and the forcible manner in which in a schism in a Donatist church, led by Maximianus, the stronger party had seized the church property. The fact that the schism was afterward healed without requirement of rebaptism on either side he uses against the Donatists to show their inconsistency in requiring rebaptism of Catholics. The deeds of the fanatical Circumcelliones are also used to show the intolerant, persecuting spirit of the Donatists.

6. *The Donatists and the Carthaginian Council* (A. D. 411). A great effort having been made (395 onw.) to conciliate the Donatists by allowing their clergy to retain their dignity and by making an amicable adjustment of

claims to church property, etc., with little success, the emperor, Theodosius II., issued an edict (411) commanding the Donatist bishops of Africa to meet the Catholic bishops at Carthage in a great conference.

The Donatist bishops went much against their inclination, having no confidence in such measures. They were indignant that an imperial commissioner should preside. The Donatists were sullen, the Catholics imperious, and the discussion amounted to nothing.

Of the Catholic bishops of Proconsular Africa two hundred and eighty-six were present, of the Donatists two hundred and seventy-nine. It is evident that the dioceses were small and that Catholic and Donatist congregations existed side by side in nearly every community.

The Donatists were condemned and a fierce persecution ensued. The Vandals, however, put an end to party strife, persecuting Catholics and Donatists alike, and introducing Arianism (429 onw.). The Donatists declined from the middle of the fifth century, but maintained themselves as a distinct party until the sixth century or later.

II. ON THE RELATIONS OF THE GODHEAD—THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY.

LITERATURE: Athanasius, "*Orat. Contra Arianos*," "*De Decretis Synodæ Nicænæ*," "*De Sententia Dionysii*," "*Apologia contr. Arianos*," "*Historia Arianorum*," etc.; Basil, "*Adv. Eunomium*"; Greg. Naz., "*Orationes Theologicæ*"; Greg. Nys., "*Contra Eunomium*"; Hilary, "*De Trinitate*"; Ambrose, "*De Fide*"; Augustine, "*De Trinitate Contra Maximinum Arianum*"; Epiphanius, "*Ancoratus*"; Hardouin and Mansi, "*Concilia*"; "*Fragmenta Arianorum*," in Mai's "*Scriptorum Vet. Nov. Coll.*," Vol. III.; Dorner, "Person of Christ," Div. I., Vol. II.; Neander, Vol. II., p. 403, *seq.*, Schaff, Vol. II., pp. 616–698; Baur, "*Gesch. d. Lehre der Dreieinigkeit*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 306–825, and "*Dogmengeschichte*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 133–282; Kölling, "*Gesch. d. Arianischen Häresie*," 1874; works on the history of doctrine, by Harnack, Loofs, Seeberg, Thomasius, Hagenbach, Shedd, Sheldon, and Fisher; Hefele, "Hist. of Councils," Vol. I.; De Broglie, "*L'Eglise et l'Empire*"; Voigt, "*Die Lehre d. Athanasius*"; Newman, "The Arians of the Fourth Century"; Gibbon, "Dec. and Fall," Chap. 21; Stanley, "Eastern Church," Lect. II.–VII.; Gwatkin, "Studies of Arianism" and "The Arian Controversy"; articles on Arius (Arianism), Athanasius, Eusebius, Eunomius, etc., in Smith and Wace, Hauck-Herzog, Wetzer u. Welte, Lichtenberger, and McClintock and Strong.

[illegible] Christ was

I. *Preliminary Observations.*

How early Christians [illegible]

It was the doctrine of the pre-existent Logos that more than any other had agitated the world of theological thought during the second and third centuries. We have seen that the Christians were driven to the expression of definite views on this subject by the pressure of Gnosticism on the one hand, with its emanation theory, and of Ebionism on the other, with its utter rejection of Christ's deity. We have seen that an influential part of the church, represented by Noëtus, Praxeas, Sabellius, and Beryl, had, with a view to obviating the Gnostic and Ebionitic conclusions, striven to identify Father and Son absolutely. This involved either Patripassianism (the maintenance that the birth and sufferings of the Son can be attributed equally to the Father) or Docetism (the incarnation and the sufferings of the Son being regarded as merely phenomenal). Patripassianism was, from the first, repugnant to the Christian consciousness in general, and its success in gaining adherents may have been due, in part, to the laxity of discipline with which it appears to have been commonly associated.

The problem now forced itself upon the minds of Christian thinkers, of distinguishing between Father and Son, without denying either the humanity or the absolute deity of the latter. We have seen how Tertullian, by his "Economy," and Origen, by his "Eternal Generation," attempted to meet the case. Dionysius of Alexandria, in controversy with the Sabellians (about 260), declared that the "Son of God is a work and a creature, not appertaining to him by nature, but as regards his essence as foreign to the Father as is the husbandman to the vine. . . For, as a creature, he did not exist before he was produced." These expressions awakened vigorous opposition, and the matter was laid before Dionysius, bishop of Rome, who called a synod for the consideration of the question. Dionysius of Alexandria afterward disowned the opinions mentioned, and in the Arian controversy his authority was claimed by both parties.

Dionysius of Rome (with the concurrence of the synod) rejected the expressions of his Alexandrian namesake, together with anything that would imply that there was a time when the Son was not. He held that the Son was always in the Father as his Power and Wisdom. "It is necessary for the divine Logos to be united with the God of the universe, and in God the Holy Spirit, also, must be embosomed and dwell. And now it is altogether necessary that the divine Triad be summed up and brought together into a head, as it were—I mean in God, the creator of the universe."

During the closing years of the third century and the opening of the fourth, theological thought was focused upon this great question. There was still a constant vacillation between subordinationism and Sabellianism. In the nature of things, such a state of vacillation on a question that profoundly agitated men's minds could not long continue. The time had come when Christian thinkers must decide either that the Son is a creature, and hence, not eternal, and not in the highest sense divine; or, that he is uncreated, eternal, truly God, of the same essence with the Father, yet with a personality distinct from that of the Father.

By the beginning of the fourth century, the idea of the absoluteness of the Christian religion had taken strong hold upon the Christian consciousness. This pre-supposed, Christianity could not long remain content with any statement that involved the subordination of its head. If Christianity is the absolute religion, the Christ must be regarded as absolutely divine. It was, therefore, no accident that the Nicene-Athanasian formulæ of the relations of the Godhead should have finally prevailed, and should have become part and parcel of the Christianity of the subsequent ages.

We observe here, as we shall constantly have occasion to observe, the speculative character of Oriental theology, as contrasted with the practical tendency of the Occidental. Western Christians saw clearly the practical need of asserting the absolute deity of Christ, and were somewhat indifferent to minute distinctions. Eastern Christians, on the other hand, often spent their energies in fruitless hair-splitting.

The Arian controversy was widespread, violent, and prolonged. For nearly a century it absorbed a large share of the energies of almost the entire Christian brotherhood. It was the occasion of innumerable scenes of bloodshed and violence, and it rent asunder whole sections of Christendom.

2. *Rise of the Controversy.*

We have seen that from the time of Origen Oriental Christendom was constantly agitating the question of the relations of the Godhead. Arius, a presbyter of the Alexandrian church, had received his religious training at Antioch, under Lucian. In opposition to the allegorical interpretation which prevailed at Alexandria, Arius had learned to interpret the Bible grammatically and historically. He seems to have been almost destitute of the intuitive faculty for which Alexandrian theologians were distinguished, and his mind demanded an entirely clear and rational statement of the doctrine that was agitating the churches. Origen's theory of the eternal generation of the Logos had no meaning for him. "We must either suppose two divine original essences, without beginning and independent of each other, we must substitute a dyarchy for a monarchy, or we must not shrink from asserting that the Logos had a beginning of his existence—that there was when he was not."

Arius was a man of pure and ascetical life, and his influence in Alexandria soon began to be felt. In 321 Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, called a synod, which deposed him from the presbyterate and excluded him from the communion of the church. The result was a schism in the Alexandrian church which soon spread far and wide.

3. *The Three Parties in the Controversy.*

(1) *The Arian.* This party during the early stages of the controversy was not strong. Comparatively few were willing to accept, without qualification, Arius' statements with regard to the Logos. But a very large number, who had always, after the example of Origen, held to a subordination of the Logos, protested against the intolerance of Alexander, and hence were practically defenders of Arianism.

We may sum up the strict Arian view as follows:

a. The Son was created out of nothing; hence, he is *different in essence* (ἑτερυυύσιος) from the Father; that he is Logos, Wisdom, Son of God, is only of grace. He is not so in himself.

b. There was, when he was not; *i. e.*, he is a finite being.

c. He was created before everything else, and through him the universe was created and is administered.

d. In the historical Christ the human element is merely the material; the soul is the Logos. The historical Christ, therefore, had no human soul, and the human elements that appear so prominently in the Gospels, are attributed to the Logos. This is one of the favorite arguments of the Arians for the finiteness and imperfection of the Logos. The earlier theologians, with the exception of Origen, had made no distinction between the divine and the human in Christ, and the orthodox theologians were not able to meet this telling argument of the Arians by making such distinction.

e. The Arians held, that although the incarnate Logos is finite, and hence not God, he is to be worshiped, as being unspeakably exalted above all other creatures, the immediate Creator and Governor of the universe, and the Redeemer of man.

f. The Arians adhered to the Scriptures, and were willing to employ as their own any scriptural statements of doctrine.

(2) *The Athanasian Party*. This party was driven to the rigorous definition of the relations of the Godhead by the harsh polemical statements of the Arians. The Origenistic representation was too metaphysical and was a constant occasion of theological agitation. The needs of the case were: to utterly repudiate the hypothesis of any sort of subordination on the part of the Son; to hold fast to the absolute deity of the historical Christ; and to obviate Patripassianism.

According to the Arian theory, which was thought to be the logical outgrowth of the Origenistic, the Son does not even know the Father perfectly. If the Son does not know the Father perfectly, then Christianity is not the absolute religion. But Christianity is the absolute religion, therefore the Son must have made a perfect revelation, *i. e.*, must be absolutely divine. This absolutely divine Son was, as a matter of course, identified with the historical Christ.

Patripassianism never had a very strong hold upon the Christian consciousness, and was by this time looked upon as blasphemous. Hence, a distinction of personalities in the Godhead must be made, if the life and the death of the historical Christ were real, which was not doubted.

We may summarize the Athanasian view of the person of Christ as follows:

a. The Son was begotten, not by the will of the Father, as Origen supposed, but by a necessity of the Father's nature. As God is unchangeable, there never was when he was not Father. Just as God is good and merciful, not by an exercise of will, but by nature, so he is paternal. Nature goes before all willing. The distinction of Father and Son is, therefore, an *eternal* distinction.

b. The Son is *identical in substance* (ὁμοούσιος) with the Father. His deity is identical with the deity of the Father. Athanasius and his party discarded the Platonic exaltation of God above all relations to the universe, which Origen, Arius, etc., adhered to. Creation was the work of the Son, but not because it was beneath the dignity of the Father. The Arian view, it was held, in denying the absolute deity of Christ, destroys the possibility of the union of man with God. If Christ is not God there is no true redemption for man.

c. Athanasius emphasized the *personality* of the Son just as much as his identity in essence with the Father. Personality is involved in Athanasius' idea of Sonship. The Son is not a mere attribute or mode of manifestation of the Father, but an independent personal subsistence. Yet Athanasius would not allow anything that involves a partition of the divine essence. He illustrates his idea of the relation of Father and Son by the relation of light and its reflection, thus really subordinating the Son to the Father.

Athanasius thus set forth with great clearness the two elements of the doctrine—the sameness of essence and the distinction of personality of Father and Son. Later theologians, such as Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory Nazianzen, attempted to reconcile the two propositions of Athanasius, *i. e.*, to make clear wherein the oneness and wherein the trinity consists.

(3) *The Semi-Arian or Eusebian Party.* We may regard this large and influential party as, on the one hand, a continuation of the Ante-Nicene Origenistic party, and on the other hand as a mediation between Arianism and Athanasianism. Most of the early defenders of Arius were not willing, with Arius, to deny absolutely the deity of Christ, yet they were just as loth to accept the, to them, self-contradictory representation of Athanasius.

The creed of the Semi-Arians may be summed up as follows:

a. They rejected the *Arian* view that the Son was created out of nothing, and hence is different in essence from the Father; that "there was when the Son was not"; that the Son is a creature or a birth in the sense in which other things are created and born.

b. On the other hand, they declared that the Son was begotten of the Father, *before all time*, God of God, entire of entire, only of the only, perfect of the perfect, image of the deity, the essence, the will, the power, and the glory of the Father. Yet they denied the Athanasian *sameness of essence*, holding only to *likeness as to essence* (ὁμοιούσιος).

REMARK.—This party appears in history chiefly in an apologetic way, and most of its members were probably nearer to the Arians than to the Athanasians.

4. *The Arians and the Nicene Council.*

The chief object of the Nicene Council was to settle the Arian controversy, which so seriously imperiled the unity of organized Christianity that Constantine had much at heart. In the council were three distinct parties, the Arian, the Semi-Arian or Origenistic, and the Athanasian. At the opening of the council the Arians proposed a creed, signed by eighteen names. This was indignantly rejected and torn in pieces. All the signers, except Arius and two bishops, now abandoned the cause of the Arians.

Eusebius of Cæsarea then proposed an ancient Palestinian creed, which acknowledged the divine nature of Christ in general biblical terms. The emperor had already expressed a favorable opinion of this creed. The Arians were willing to subscribe to it, but this latter fact made the Athanasian party suspicious. They wanted a creed that no Arian could subscribe, and insisted on inserting the term meaning *identical in substance* (ὁμυυύσιος).

The Nicene Creed in nearly its present form was then proposed, and the emperor having decided to support the Athanasian party, subscription to this was required of all the bishops. The Semi-Arian bishops, who maintained that the Son was not *identical* in essence with the Father, but was of a *similar essence* (ὁμοιούσιος), after considerable hesitation signed the document for the sake of peace, explaining, by way of protest, their precise position.

Two Egyptian bishops, Theonas and Secundus, persistently refused to sign it, and together with Arius were banished to Illyria. Thus the Athanasian party was for a time victorious, and the Arians were suppressed as far as possible by imperial force.

Athanasius, at this time a young man, soon became the acknowledged leader of the Nicene party, and used his great dialectic powers in writing and preaching against Arianism.

5. *Arian and Semi-Arian Reaction.*

It is probable that Constantine himself, so far as he had any convictions on the subject, was from the first inclined to Semi-Arianism. Soon after the closing of the council the Semi-Arians began to assail the Nicene creed and to insist upon the *similarity* over against the *sameness* of essence.

Constantine, through the influence of Eusebius, recalled Arius and his party from exile (328). In 330 he required Athanasius, now bishop of Alexandria, to restore Arius to his office, and on his refusing was on the point of deposing him, but was awed by the personality of Athanasius. The influence of the Eusebian party was increasing, and in 335 an Arian Synod was convoked at Tyre which condemned the Athanasian party. The emperor banished Athanasius to Treves, and Arius was about to be restored to his position in the Alexandrian church when he died suddenly, aged eighty.

After the death of Constantine (337) Constantius reigned in the East and Constantine II. in the West. The former was an Arian, the latter an adherent of the Nicene creed. The Western church was all along predominantly orthodox, the Eastern predominantly Arian or Semi-Arian. Constantine II. restored Athanasius, but he was deposed again after the death of this emperor (340). Constantius restored Athanasius a third time (346), but after the death of Constans (350) he was driven from Alexandria by Constantius with an armed force.

Constantius, now sole emperor, introduced Arianism into the West. The orthodox bishop of Rome was dethroned and an Arian put in his place, but the former was restored after the death of the latter on signing Arian articles. Even Hosius of Cordova, who had been foremost in the Nicene Council, was at last induced to subscribe Arian articles.

For some years before the authoritative introduction of Arianism into the West the Arians had been zealously prosecuting mission work among the Goths and other barbarians. Ulfilas, the great apostle of the Goths, translated the Bible into Gothic about 350. Arianism gained a strong hold upon these nations that were becoming every year a more important element in the politics and civilization of Europe.

6. *Victory of the Athanasian Party.*

Constantius died in 361. Julian was indifferent to Christian parties. The Athanasian party, when freedom was again allowed, rapidly regained their power in the West and made progress in the East. The Emperor Valens (364–378) persecuted the Athanasians with fanatical zeal. Theodosius the Great (392–395) completed the victory of orthodoxy in the Roman Empire, yet Arianism continued for a long time to prevail among the barbarians. The conversion to orthodoxy of Clovis, king of the Franks (496), was followed by a rapid decline of Arianism among the Teutonic peoples.

III. THE ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSIES.

LITERATURE: A large body of important matter is published in connection with the Migne edition of Origen's works. See also the pertinent sections in the works on the history of doctrine; in Dorner's "The Person of Christ"; in Hefele's "History of Councils"; in the general works on church history and in the encyclopedias of Smith and Wace, Wetzer u. Welte, Herzog-Hauck, and Lichtenberger.

Controversies regarding many aspects of his teachings arose during the lifetime of Origen and were perpetuated until the middle of the sixth century. Methodius, bishop of Patara (Asia Minor), about the beginning of the present period assailed with great bitterness Origen's teachings regarding the creation, the relation of soul and body, the resurrection, free will, etc. Methodius denied the eternity of the creative process, the fall of the soul in a pre-existent state and its probationary imprisonment in the body, the spirituality of the resurrection (involving denial of the resurrection of the body), and the inability of man to repel evil thoughts with the temptations involved. A number of zealous defenders of the great master were promptly in the arena, among them Eusebius of Cæsarea and Pamphilus, his friend. The following are the more important of the phases of the controversy that fall within the present period:

1. *In Relation to the Arian Controversy.*

At first there was a disposition on both sides of the Arian controversy to ignore the teachings of Origen. But some of the aspects of Arianism were so manifestly in accord with Origen's teachings that the Athanasians began to stigmatize him as "the father of Arianism." The Arians naturally were glad to claim the support of so great a name.

Eusebius of Cæsarea and the Semi-Arians zealously defended the reputation of Origen, while Pachomius, the founder of monasticism, who had adopted anthropomorphite views, regarded the spiritualistic teachings of the Origenists with the utmost disfavor, supposing that such views polluted the bodies as well as the souls of those who accepted them.

Athanasius, while recognizing the errors of Origen, defended him against the fanatical assaults of the anthropomorphites. During the course of the century, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzen, and Gregory of Nyssa, sought to save the reputation of Origen for orthodoxy, while Epiphanius reiterated the charges of Methodius and assailed his allegorical method of interpreting the Scriptures.

The controversies of this time were almost purely literary and did not enter the realm of ecclesiastical politics.

2. *Politico-Ecclesiastical Strife in Palestine and in Egypt* (A. D. 390 onward).

(1) *Jerome, Aterbius, Epiphanius, and Rufinus.* Palestine, where Origen had spent the latter half of his life, had always been devoted to his memory and faithful to his teachings. At this time Jerome and his devoted friend Paula from Italy were presiding over monastic institutions at Bethlehem, while Rufinus and Melania, likewise from Italy, had established religious houses on the mount of Olives. Without accepting all his teachings, Jerome and Rufinus were both earnest students of Origen's works and were disposed to guard his reputation from unjust imputations.

In 392 Aterbius, an Egyptian anthropomorphite monk, came to Jerusalem and attacked Jerome and Rufinus as Origenists. Jerome repudiated Origen's errors, but sought to minimize them. John, bishop of Jerusalem, and Rufinus, stanchly defended Origen.

In 394 Epiphanius, bishop of Cyprus, came to Palestine with the avowed object of crushing Origenism. Jerome was ready by this time to co-operate with him in his onslaught against John and Rufinus. Epiphanius undertook to excommunicate John and to install in his place Paulinianus, a brother of Jerome.

Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, was appealed to by John and sought to reconcile the contending factions. Though Origenistic in his sympathies, he was finally led to ally himself with Jerome.

Rufinus made peace with Jerome and soon afterward returned to Italy, where he translated into Latin the defense of Origen by Pamphilus and Origen's great work on "First Principles." He rejected some of the more objectionable expressions in Origen's works as interpolations and professed his aversion to the characteristic errors of Origen; but Jerome's polemical zeal was aroused afresh and he insisted that Rufinus could not escape personal responsibility for such views of Origen as he had put forth in the translation. Jerome succeeded in inducing the Roman bishop, Anastasius, who was profoundly ignorant of Origen's works, to condemn them, and the Emperor Honorius to prohibit their use (A. D. 400).

(2) *Theophilus and the Anthropomorphite Monks.* In 399 Theophilus aroused the anthropomorphite monks to a murderous fury by an unhappy expression in an Easter letter. To escape their vengeance he disclaimed sympathy with Origenistic teaching and made use of language which they interpreted in an anthropomorphic sense. The Origenistic monks (the "Tall Brethren") now turned against their bishop. He determined to crush Origenism, and secured the co-operation of Epiphanius of Cyprus, Anastasius of Rome, and of a synod in Jerusalem. Theophilus now put forth in a synodal letter a catalogue of the heresies of Origen's "First Principles," including his teaching regarding the ultimate restoration to divine favor of evil men and angels and of Satan himself, and denounced Origen as "the hydra of all heresies." He drove three hundred of the Origenistic monks from the Nitrian desert, who with others took refuge in Constantinople and sought the protection of Chrysostom, the patriarch.

The Emperor Arcadius was led by the reports of Theophilus' cruelties to summon him to the capital. Epiphanius went in advance to explain matters, and on Theophilus' arrival he found little difficulty in vindicating himself and in procuring the condemnation of Chrysostom by a small council for the favor he had shown to the Origenistic monks (403).

(3) *Justinian's Repressive Measure* (*c.* 542). The Nestorian and the Eutychian controversies were already raging, and controversy on the teachings of Origen came little into notice until about 520 when trouble arose in the Palestinian Laura. The expulsion of four

Origenistic monks by the head of the institution and their secret restoration some time afterward by his successor led to an appeal to Constantinople. Avowed Origenism rapidly spread throughout Palestine. After much controversy Justinian was led to issue an edict for the suppression of Origenism throughout the empire (*c.* 542). It was crushed to rise no more as a distinct party, though Origen's peculiar views have rarely been without their zealous supporters.

IV. ON CHRISTOLOGY—THE NESTORIAN, EUTYCHIAN, AND MONOTHELITE CONTROVERSIES, ETC.

1. *Preliminary Observations.*

Very little effort had been made during the first three centuries to analyze the person of Christ. Whether he had a complete human and a complete divine nature was not an agitated question. Origen was probably the first to say distinctly that Christ had a human soul, this being in accord with his theory that Christ became a man to save men, an angel to save angels.

Arius expressly denied that Christ had a human soul, and this view was admirably adapted to his polemical purpose, viz., that of showing the imperfection of the Logos.

Athanasius did not, as he might have been expected to do, answer Arius with the assertion of the complete divinity and the complete humanity of Christ and ascribe what seemed unsuitable to deity in the New Testament representation to Christ's human nature. But he answered him with the assertion that when Christ spoke or acted in a manner inconsistent with deity (as, *e. g.*, when he said: "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?") he spoke in our name, because he had put himself into our place and had taken upon himself our guilt and abasement, or else he spoke by way of accommodation to the ignorance of his disciples.

Gregory Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa adopted and developed the Origenistic doctrine that the Logos united himself with the sensuous nature by the mediation of a rational human soul. They held that the divine Logos took all parts of human nature into fellowship with himself and pervaded them. This permeation of the human by the divine was potential from Christ's birth, but was fully realized only after the resurrection and ascension.

Apollinaris (about 370) first took up the question in a polemical way. In accordance with the Platonic trichotomy (body, soul, and spirit), he maintained that Christ had a human body and soul, but that the divine Logos took the place of the human spirit. His aim was to maintain the complete union of the divine and human in Christ. He thought it absurd to speak of Christ as wholly God and wholly man. He is rather a mixture of God and man. This view he illustrated, without irreverent intent, by the case of hybrid animals. There exists then in Christ *only one personality*. Apollinaris laid so much stress upon the complete fusion of the divine and the human in Christ that he did not hesitate to say "God died," "God was born," etc.

This theory once clearly stated aroused opposition among the churches. Athanasius himself was now led to declare the complete humanity as well as the complete deity of Christ. Gregory Nazianzen and also Gregory of Nyssa wrote against Apollinaris. This doctrine was condemned in several minor synods, and finally in the Second Constantinopolitan Council (381).

But it was in the Antiochian school that Apollinaris found his most formidable opponents, viz., Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia. These writers insisted on the completeness and the persistent integrity of the humanity of Christ. Theodore fully elaborated the theory known in the history of doctrine as Nestorianism.

2. *The Nestorian Controversy.*

LITERATURE: Homilies of Nestorius, in Migne's Patrology, Vol. XLVIII. (Lat. trans.); "*Acta Conc. Eph.*," in Hardouin and Mansi; Theodoret, writings against Cyril; Theodore of Mopsuestia, Fragments; Evagrius, "*H. E.*," Bk. I., Chap. 2–7, Socrates, "*H. E.*," Bk. VII., Chap. 29–35; Cyril, writings against Nestorius; Neander, Vol. II., p. 505, *seq.*; Schaff, Vol. II., p. 714, *seq.*; Milman, "Latin Christianity," Vol. I., p. 195, *seq.*, Gieseler, Vol. I., p. 343, *seq.*; Baur, "*Lehre von d. Dreieinigkeit*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 693, *seq.*; Dorner, "Person of Christ," Div. II., Vol.

I., p. 51, *seq.*, etc.; works on the history of doctrine, referred to above; and articles on "Nestorius," "Cyril," "John of Antioch," "Leo the Great," "Theodoret," the Councils of "Ephesus," and "Chalcedon," etc., in the encyclopedias, especially Smith and Wace and Herzog-Hauck.

(1) *Rise of the Nestorian Controversy.*

We have seen the rise and progress of two modes of thought with regard to the person of Christ: the one insisting upon the completeness of both natures and yet not able to show clearly the consistency of this representation with unity of personality; the other emphasizing the unity of personality in the incarnate Christ and denying the completeness of his humanity from its supposed inconsistency with such unity. The former view prevailed among the Antiochian theologians, who, by reason of their grammatico-historical interpretation of Scripture, naturally tended to emphasize the human side of Christ's nature; the latter, among the Alexandrian.

Nestorius, a devout, learned, and eloquent monk, was presbyter of the church of Antioch, and in 428 was made patriarch of Constantinople. At Constantinople he found many erroneous expressions and modes of thought current in the church. Especially offensive to him was the term, "mother of God" (ϑεοτόκος), applied to Mary. He declared that if this representation were true, the heathen were right in representing their gods as having mothers. Mary did not bear God, but the man (Jesus) who is the organ of the deity. Opposition was aroused at Constantinople, but Nestorius found his fiercest antagonist in Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria.

(2) *Statement of the Opposing Views in the Controversy.*

a. Nestorius' View of the Relations of the Human and Divine in Christ. Nestorius as an Antiochian and as a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia, in whom the Antiochian humanism may be said to have culminated, held to the following views:

(*a*) That in Christ the two natures remained distinct, yet are closely joined together and are harmonious in will.

(*b*) That only by accommodation can Mary be spoken of as the mother of God (ϑεοτόκος). We may venerate the human on account of its close connection with the divine, but we must beware of confounding it with the divine.

(*c*) Nestorius explained by this theory all those passages in the Gospels in which Christ is represented as being subject to temptations, wants, sufferings, etc. In fact, the method of interpreting Scripture that prevailed in Antioch lay at the foundation of this extremely humanistic view of the historical Christ.

b. Cyril's Opposing Views. Cyril of Alexandria was one of the most violent polemicists of that polemical age, and into this controversy, as well as that with the Neo-Platonists, he entered with fanatical zeal.

Apart from dogmatical considerations, he was probably glad of an opportunity to humiliate the patriarchates of Constantinople and Antioch, and to this end he did not scruple to employ the ready instrumentality of court intrigue.

After some correspondence with Nestorius he presented twelve propositions, with anathemas attached, for his acceptance. They are for substance as follows:

(*a*) God is in truth Immanuel, and on this account the holy virgin is mother of God, for she brought forth carnally the Word of [proceeding from] God become flesh.

(*b*) The Word [proceeding] from God the Father is in the flesh one in essence, and Christ with his own flesh is one and evidently at the same time God and man.

(*c*) Hence, after the union, the natures in the one Christ are not to be distinguished, nor is it to be said that they are merely joined together in dignity or power. Rather they have come together according to natural (*φυσικός*) unity.

(*d*) The application of certain facts and expressions in the New Testament to the human as unworthy of the divine nature, and of others to the divine as too exalted for the human, is condemned.

(*e*) Christ is not to be called a theophoric (God-bearing) man, but rather God in truth, as one Son by nature.

(*f*) Neither is it to be said that the Word, which is from God the Father, is God or Master of Christ, but rather that he is at the same time God and man.

(*g*) It must not be said that Jesus as a man was energized by the Word of God, and that the dignity of the only begotten was bestowed, as being another apart from himself.

(*h*) It must not be said that the man having been assumed is to be worshiped and glorified together with God the Word, and is to be called God in a sense not involving a recognition of him as Immanuel.

(*i*) It must not be said that the one Lord Jesus Christ was glorified by the Spirit, using through him (the Spirit) a power foreign to himself, but rather that the Holy Spirit is his very own and is used by him.

(*k*) The Word of God actually became flesh according to the Scripture, and he offered up himself not for himself, but rather for us alone.

(*l*) The flesh of the Lord is life-giving, as being an integral part of the Word of God himself.

(*m*) God the Word suffered in the flesh, was crucified in the flesh, tasted death in the flesh.

The favorite text of Cyril was: "The Word became flesh."

The purport of this series of propositions, in which Cyril meant to exclude every phase of the Antiochian view, is: That the Incarnate Word is absolutely one; is at the same time absolutely divine and absolutely human.

Whatever is said about Christ Jesus in the New Testament, is said about this one divine-human being. Such expressions as were regarded as unsuitable to Deity were sometimes explained by this party docetically, *i. e.*, were represented as a mere accommodation to the ignorance of the disciples, etc.

(3) *Progress of the Controversy.*

a. The Appeal to the Bishop of Rome, and Agitation by Cyril. After some correspondence between Nestorius and Cyril, both parties laid their views before Coelestin, bishop of Rome. The fact that Nestorius had recently shown some favor to the Pelagians, predisposed the Roman bishop against him; and in a Roman synod (430) Nestorius' views were condemned, and he was commanded to recant on pain of excommunication. To Cyril was entrusted the office of making known the decree to Nestorius. The Constantinopolitans and the Oriental bishops were warned against the errors of Nestorius.

Cyril had from the beginning of the controversy made the fullest use of all the means at his disposal for arousing hostility to Nestorius: the fanatical monks; clergy, whose vanity had been injured by the appointment of a foreigner rather than one of themselves to the patriarchate; the corrupt and powerful Pulcheria, the emperor's sister; the bishop of Rome, who was glad of any opportunity to get his judicial prerogatives recognized.

b. The Council of Ephesus (431). The emperor, Theodosius II., was suspicious of Cyril, and reproached him for trying to meddle with the affairs of the imperial court, and with the patriarchate of Constantinople.

When Cyril had issued his twelve propositions for the acceptance of Nestorius, the controversy ceased to be a private one between Cyril and Nestorius.

John, Patriarch of Antioch, had advised Nestorius to allow the use of the expression "Mother of God," in a modified sense. Cyril's propositions showed that it was no longer a question of the employment or rejection of a word. Cyril had attacked the Antiochian theology, and in such a way to leave no room for evasion. The controversy now became general between the Antiochians and the Alexandrians.

Nestorius issued counter-propositions and anathemas, and Theodoret of Cyrus, one of the foremost scholars and thinkers of the age, now entered the field of controversy as a representative of the Antiochian theology. Neither party understood, nor cared to understand, the position of the other. Each sadly misrepresented the other, and by stating its own views and those of its opponents in the extremest form made the breach as wide as possible.

The emperor saw no other way of restoring peace than by calling a General Council. It was his intention to have both sides fairly represented, to secure an impartial investigation of the matters in dispute, and thus to have the truth prevail.

The bishop of Ephesus, Memnon, was a friend of Cyril, and as a metropolitan, may have been jealous of the supremacy of the patriarch of the Eastern capital. A large body of fanatical monks were present, ready to carry out any riotous measures that Cyril and Memnon might suggest. John of Antioch was delayed by the prevalence of famine at Antioch, by stormy weather, etc., so that he did not reach Ephesus until many days after the appointed time.

Neither did the deputies of the Roman bishop arrive promptly. It was never the intention of Cyril to overcome his opponents by fair means. With the support of Memnon and his followers, together with that of the large body of subservient clergy whom he had brought from Alexandria, he was sure of an easy victory over Nestorius.

Nestorius was pressed to sit in council with this fanatical mob, but he persistently refused. The imperial commissioner tried in vain to preserve order, and refused to give the imperial sanction to the *ex parte* council of Cyril. Cyril and Memnon, with their dependents, met notwithstanding the imperial prohibition, deposed Nestorius, and anathematized his doctrines. Cyril thus put himself in direct opposition to the imperial will. He had now before him the task of winning over the court to his support.

Some days after these transactions, John of Antioch, with his subordinates, arrived. The imperial commissioners endeavored in vain to get the two parties to unite in a deliberative assembly. John, with his own thirty bishops and a few others, met together in council, and excommunicated Cyril and Memnon for their illegal proceedings.

Both parties were strictly prohibited from visiting Constantinople. Cyril, however, sent an agent under the guise of a beggar, with a letter to Dalmatius, an aged monk of great influence, who had lived in solitude for forty-eight years. Dalmatius had long since warned the people against Nestorius, and was aroused to fanaticism by the representations of Cyril. At Dalmatius' summons the monks and abbots left their cloisters, and forming an immense torchlight procession, marched to the imperial palace. Multitudes of the people joined in the procession. Dalmatius was admitted to the imperial presence, and gave vigorous expression to his sense of the guilt of Nestorius, and of the wrong done by the emperor to the party of Cyril.

(4) *Triumph of the Alexandrian Party and the Retirement of Nestorius.*

This was the turning point in favor of Cyril. The agents of Cyril were freely admitted to the imperial presence. By bribery and other means all influential parties in Constantinople were conciliated.

The emperor saw that the popular feeling was too strong to admit of Nestorius' continuance in the patriarchate, and he was permitted to retire to his cloister.

Cyril had thus, while acting in the face of law and order, triumphed over Nestorius and gained the imperial acquiescence. But he was held responsible for the prevailing turmoil in ecclesiastical affairs; and he felt that his triumph would be more complete and lasting if he could gain the acquiescence of the Antiochians in the proceedings of the council.

In 433, accordingly, after considerable negotiation to this end, Cyril agreed to sign a creed in which "Mother of God" was applied to Mary in a limited sense, while John acquiesced in the condemnation of Nestorius, and sanctioned the appointment under Cyrilian influence of Maximianus as his successor. This compromise was effected under imperial pressure.

It was hoped that harmony would be thus restored. But the friends of Cyril were dissatisfied with his concessions to the Antiochians. The Antiochians, on the other hand, were still averse to the Alexandrian doctrine, regarding it as leading logically to Apollinarianism. Controversy, therefore, continued, and was revived in an intensified form, about 444, in the Eutychian controversy.

3. *The Eutychian Controversy.*

LITERATURE: "*Synodicon adversus Trogœdiam Irenæi*"; the Acts of the Councils of Constantinople, Ephesus II., Chalcedon; epistles of Leo the Great. These and other documents are to be found in Mansi, "*Concilia*," V., VI., VII., IX. and in Hardouin, "*Conc.*" I. and II.; Theodoret, "*Opera*," Vol. IV.; Evagrius, "*H. E.*," Bk. I., Chap. 9, *seq.*; Neander, Vol. II., p. 560, *seq.*; Dorner, "Person of Christ," Div. II., Vol. I., p. 79, *seq.*; Baur, "*Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 890, *seq.*; Gieseler, "*Commentatio qua Monophysitarum veterum variae de Christi Persona . . . illustrantur*"; Walch, "*Hist. d. Ketzereien*," *Bd.* VI., *Seit.* 3, *seq.*; Herzog, "*Abriss d. Kirchengeschichte*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 305, *seq.*; Mœller, "Ch. Hist.," Vol. I., p. 419, *seq.*; Perry, "The Second Synod of Ephesus" (contains the "Syriac Acts of the Robber Synod," with English Translation); Krüger, "*Monophys. Streitigkeiten*"; works on the history of doctrine, especially those of Baur, Harnack, and Loofs, and encyclopedia articles on the men, councils, etc., referred to in this section.

(*1*) *Rise of the Controversy.*

We have seen that the tendency of the Nestorian controversy was to drive both parties to extremes. The compromise between the Antiochian and the Alexandrian schools really effected nothing; for though Cyril subscribed to an Antiochian creed, he never abandoned his twelve propositions and anathemas.

The fact that Cyril should have regarded it as expedient to sign such a creed shows that a reaction had set in, or at all events that the emperor was no longer willing to support him in his extreme dogmatizing.

The learned Theodoret had assumed the leadership of the Antiochian party, and his dialectic power was only equaled by his wonderful tact. In 448 he published his "*Eranistes*," or "Beggar," in which he set forth in the strongest light the logical tendencies of Monophysitism. He maintained that Monophysitism cannot escape representing God as subject to suffering and change; that in a heathenish way it confounds the human and divine. He did not direct his arguments against Cyril personally, but rather against Apollinaris and his followers. In this he showed great tact. His method was, not to confine himself to the express doctrinal statements of his opponents in their proper connection, but to put the most objectionable construction on every statement, and then to deduce the worst possible consequences from such constructions.

Cyril had died in 444, and had been succeeded by Dioscurus, a man of worse character and far less ability than Cyril. Dioscurus was Cyril's ecclesiastical successor, but his theological successor was the venerable monk, Eutyches, archimandrite of a cloister in Constantinople.

In 448, a synod, held at Constantinople, took substantially the same ground that Theodoret had taken in opposition to Monophysitism. Eutyches was charged with holding to extreme Monophysite views, and refusing to admit a duality of natures in the incarnate Christ, and the sameness in essence of Christ's body with our own, was deposed.

(2) *Statement of the Opposing Views.*

a. Eutyches' View of the Person of Christ. Eutyches carried Cyril's doctrine of the complete fusion of the natures to its logical result. He held:

(*a*) That the body of Christ was not the body of a man (σῶμα ἀνθρώπου), but a human body (σῶμα ἀνθρώπινον).

(*b*) That the body of Christ was not the same in essence with our bodies (ὁμοούσιον).

(*c*) That before the union our Lord was born of two natures; after the union there was only one nature distinguishable.

Eutyches is said to have illustrated his view of the divine and the human in Christ by the case of a drop of honey in the ocean. The human remains in some sense, but is so overwhelmed by the divine infinity as to be practically annihilated.

b. Opposing Views. Theodoret did not make any essential innovation upon the views of Theodore and Nestorius.

(*a*) In opposition to Eutyches' denial of the sameness of essence of Christ's body with our own, he maintained this sameness.

(*b*) He held that a union of the two natures had occurred; hence he confessed one Christ, one Son, one Lord.

(*c*) According to this view of the *unmingled* (ἀσύγχυτος) union, he confessed that the holy virgin was the "mother of God."

c. Substance of Leo's Letter to Flavian. The occasion and the historical importance of this epoch-making document will be discussed hereafter. It is characteristic of Western theology by reason of its practical character and its lack of delicate distinctions. It is an attempt to recognize the elements of truth in both Nestorianism and Eutychianism, without following either to its extreme consequences. Leo maintains, therefore:

(*a*) The true humanity of Christ. He supposes that the teachings of the New Testament are unequivocal on this point. He regards it as essential to Christ's redemptive work that he should have truly taken our nature. Hence, he rejects unconditionally the Eutychian view which reduced the humanity of Christ, after the union of the two natures, to an infinitesimal.

(*b*) The true divinity of the incarnate Word. This he maintained in common with both parties in the controversy.

(*c*) While each nature and substance maintained its own properties unimpaired, the two came together *in one personality*.

By reason of his human nature Christ was able to die; by reason of his divine nature he was not able to die. He assumed the form of a servant without the contamination of sin, augmenting the human, not diminishing the divine. As God is not changed by the compassion, so man is not consumed by the dignity. Each form does with the communion of the other what is proper to it; the Word, namely, operating what belongs to it; the flesh executing what belongs to the flesh. The one gleams with miracles; the other succumbs to injuries.

Leo's position was essentially that of the Antiochians. His chief merit here consists in the fact that he adhered rigidly to the Scriptures, allowing full weight to the humanistic as well as to the theistic representations of the incarnate Christ.

The new element that he introduced was the theory of *two complete natures in one person*. Yet he did not give any satisfactory explanation of this point.

He uses the term person somewhat vaguely. What he means by two complete natures in one person seems to be this: the divine Word and the man Jesus united, as they are, form Jesus Christ. Of this complex being we have in the New Testament representations which are only applicable to his human nature: suffering, dying, etc.; and representations which are applicable only to his divine nature: oneness with the Father, the performance of miracles, etc.

It was greatly to the advantage of the Roman See that this formula of the union of two perfect natures in one person, which has from that time been a leading article of Christian faith, though crudely developed and imperfectly apprehended, should have proceeded from a Roman bishop.

The adoption of Leo's view by the Council of Chalcedon, was an important victory for the papacy.

(3) *The Second Council of Ephesus, or the "Robber Synod"* (449).

The condemnation of Eutyches in the Constantinopolitan synod had aroused the most bitter enmity of the monks of Constantinople, Ephesus, Alexandria, etc., against Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople. Dioscurus was in constant communication with the imperial court, and brought all his influence to bear against Flavian and his party. Both parties wrote to Leo, bishop of Rome. Leo addressed to Flavian the celebrated epistle treated above, the drift of which was entirely adverse to Eutychianism. Through the influence of Dioscurus and Eutyches, the emperor was induced to call a council for the adjustment of the matter. From the first there was no intention of allowing a free discussion of the doctrinal points involved. Theodoret, the great theologian of the Antiochian party, was excluded from the council. Dioscurus was appointed president of the council by the emperor, and the friends of Dioscurus were made assessors. Flavian and his supporters were allowed to attend not as judges or voters, but to learn the decision of the council. Troops of ferocious monks were introduced into the assembly room for the purpose of intimidating such as might be inclined to oppose the proceedings of Dioscurus. Leo had sent deputies to the council with instructions to secure the reading and recognition of his doctrinal letter. But Dioscurus would not even allow the letter to be read. Some that refused to join in the condemnation of Flavian and his party were shut up in the assembly room, and were forced by threats and blows to subscribe to the decrees of Dioscurus. Flavian received bodily injuries which are thought to have resulted in his death. Such proceedings as these were sure to lead to a reaction in favor of the condemned party, especially as the indefatigable Leo was committed alike by his letter to Flavian, and by his sense of official dignity which had been grossly offended by the above-mentioned proceedings, to the support of the opposite party.

(4) *The Council of Chalcedon* (451).

Flavian, after the adjournment of the "Robber Synod," had lodged with the deputies of the Roman bishop an appeal to another council to be held in Italy. For such a council Leo labored most strenuously, bringing his influence to bear upon Valentinian, the western emperor, and upon Theophilus and Pulcheria. During the lifetime of Theophilus he met with little encouragement, but he had gained the good will of Pulcheria; and when (450) Pulcheria ascended the throne and associated with herself Marcian, the plans of Leo seemed likely to be realized. In accordance with his wishes, the deposed bishops were restored, and assurances were given to Leo of co-operation in his plans.

But the unsettled condition of the West, resulting from barbarian invasion, made an Italian council impracticable, and Leo was at last obliged to relinquish his plan and to content himself with the hope of controlling a general council in the East.

In 451, in accordance with the imperial summons, six hundred and thirty bishops met at Nicæa; but for certain reasons the emperor transferred the council to Chalcedon. The council was disorderly and tumultuous. Dioscurus, after a somewhat dignified defense of his proceedings at Ephesus, and a persistent refusal to subscribe Leo's doctrinal epistle, was deposed. Much opposition was at first manifested in the council by Alexandrians and by Antiochians alike, to the acceptance of the epistle of Leo. The Roman deputies declared that if the epistle was rejected, another council would be held in the West, and the Emperor Marcian, who had determined upon the ratification of the epistle, fortified this threat with his own authority. The epistle was finally ratified, and a Confession of Faith embodying its substance was accepted.

Besides accepting Leo's epistle, the council recognized the orthodoxy of the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the father of Nestorianism, of Theodoret, its ablest defender, and of Ibas, a Persian bishop, who in a letter to Maris had expounded the Nestorian views. This action of the council proved fruitful of trouble.

(5) *Substance of the Chalcedonian Symbol.*

The Chalcedonian is one of the most important of the ancient ecclesiastical symbols. Its Christology, based upon that of Leo's epistle, set forth as it is in a series of simple propositions, has been from that time to this the Christology of the great majority of Christians.

a. Our Lord Jesus Christ is declared to be perfect in deity and perfect in humanity.

b. He is consubstantial with the Father, and consubstantial with us.

c. He was born of the Virgin Mary, the mother of God.

d. This one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only-begotten, is to be acknowledged in two natures, inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably; the distinction of the natures being by no means taken away through the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one person and one subsistence.

(6) *Persistence of the Controversy.*

Ten Egyptian bishops refused to anathematize the doctrines of Eutyches and to subscribe the letter of Leo. In Egypt and Alexandria the controversy, led by fanatical monks, soon raged more fiercely than ever before. The Eutychians came to be commonly known as Monophysites (because of their insistence on the *oneness of nature* in the person of Christ). They had their stronghold in Egypt and Abyssinia, but were numerous throughout the East.

(7) *Justinian and the "Three Chapters."*

Justinian was an earnest adherent to the symbol of Chalcedon, but the notorious Theodora, his wife, favored the Monophysites.

By her intrigues, Theodora managed to secure the election of the unprincipled Vigilius as bishop of Rome, who, in turn, recognized the orthodoxy of Theodora's Monophysite favorites in the East. Justinian was anxious for ecclesiastical unity, and was willing to this end to make concessions to the Monophysites.

The Monophysite leaders objected to the Chalcedonian symbol on the ground that avowed favorers of Nesto-

[illegible] the [illegible] the [illegible]
of manicheism.

rianism had been participants in the council, and their writings recognized as orthodox. They objected especially to the recognition of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas. They agreed to submit to the authority of the Council of Chalcedon on condition that Theodore and his writings, Theodoret's writings against Cyril and in defense of Nestorius, and Ibas' letter to Maris, should be anathematized by imperial edict, and that these writings or the recognition of their orthodoxy should be expunged from the acts of the council. To this Justinian agreed, and he issued such an edict, anathematizing at the same time any that should, with these exceptions, reject the authority of the Chalcedonian council.

This, of course, aroused far more strife than it allayed. Especially in the North African and the Illyrian churches was the opposition to the condemnation of the "Three Chapters" manifested. Vigilius, the unprincipled Roman bishop, was caressed and imprisoned and excommunicated in turn. He was induced to take oaths to use his influence against the "Three Chapters," which oaths, when freed from restraint, he persistently violated. Bishops in Northern Africa and in Illyria were deposed by imperial command, and others set up in their places, not without much shedding of blood.

At length in 553, having long and earnestly endeavored to allay the strife, Justinian called a council at Constantinople which condemned Theodore but vindicated Theodoret and Ibas.

But even this did not end the controversy.

349

4. *The Monothelite Controversy.*

LITERATURE: Documents and Acts of Councils, in Mansi, "*Conc.*" X., XI., and in Hardouin, "*Conc.*" III.; Nicephori, "*Breviarium Historiæ*"; Combesisii, "*Historia Hæresis Monotheletarum*"; Dorner, "Person of Christ," Div. II., Vol. I., p. 155, *seq.*; Neander, Vol. III., p. 175, *seq.*; Baur, "*Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit*," *Bd.* II., "*Dogmengeschichte*," *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 88, *seq.*; pertinent sections in the works on the history of doctrines; Herzog-Hauck, and Wetzer u. Welter, Art. "*Monotheleten.*"

(*1*) *Rise of the Controversy.*

From the time of Justinian the doctrine of the two natures may be said to have been supreme in the Roman empire, both eastern and western. The Monophysites, being no longer tolerated in the established church, now became a schismatical party, with church organization, bishops, and patriarchs of their own. In the East, chiefly under the leadership of James, bishop of Edessa, a great missionary activity was developed, and the Monophysites spread into Armenia and Persia. Antioch, which had been the birthplace and the chief nursery of Nestorianism (Dyophysitism), became the chief center of Monothelitism and has continued to the present day to be the residence of the patriarchs of the party that adopted the name of James ("Jacobites"). In Egypt, by the beginning of the seventh century, the Monophysites had come to outnumber those in the communion of the established church ten to one; and from Egypt they spread into Abyssinia, where also they still constitute a strong party.

Probably in the fifth century, there appeared among the Monophysites that strange body of writings purporting to have been composed by Dionysius the Areopagite, who was converted under Paul's preaching at Athens. The transcendental character of these writings, resulting from the mixture of Platonism with Christianity, was in entire accord with the Monophysite ideas of the relations of the human and the divine in Christ. This writing was very popular among the Monophysites, and afterward among the Catholics. Through this work and through other instrumentalities, Monophysitic conceptions had become widespread outside of Monophysitism. A favorite argument with the Monophysites against the doctrine of the two natures was the fact that two natures required the supposition of two wills. This they regarded as contradictory to the fact, and maintained that there remained in Christ after the union one nature, and hence, one will.

The question as to the human will of Christ was not brought out distinctly either by the Antiochians, or by Leo the Great, or by the Council of Chalcedon. Maintaining, as they did, the persistent integrity of Christ's human nature, they may be supposed to have held implicitly to the persistence of the human will, side by side with the divine, and in perfect harmony therewith.

In 614 the Persians invaded Syria and Palestine, and plundered Jerusalem. Afterward they laid waste Northern Africa, as far as Carthage. In 621 the Persian army was threatening Constantinople. The encroachments of the Persians led the Emperor Heraclius to make use of all available means for self-defense. A large proportion of his subjects were alienated from him on account of the Monophysite schism, and these seemed likely to throw themselves into the arms of the Persians, and thus to prove an element of weakness to the empire. It occurred to Heraclius and his advisers that something ought to be done for the conciliation of the Monophysites. As before remarked, a strong Monophysite tendency, as opposed to the extreme Dyophysite interpretation of the Chalcedonian Symbol, had become diffused throughout the churches. Dionysius the Areopagite had employed the expression, "divine-human energy" (*θεάνδρικη ἐνέργεια*), as descriptive of Christ's activity. Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, thought that by the confession of two natures and *one energy* in Christ, the Monophysites might be conciliated without sacrificing entirely the Chalcedonian Symbol.

In 626 the emperor had a conference with Cyrus, bishop of Phasis, and by means of arguments and promises of promotion, made of him a zealous advocate of the compromise measure. Cyrus became patriarch of Alexandria in 630.

In 629 the emperor won over to his position Athanasius, the leader of the Syrian Monophysites, and made him patriarch of Antioch. There were now three Monothelite patriarchs. Cyrus took measures at once for carrying out the imperial scheme of union, and drew up a series of articles to be submitted to the Monophysites. In the seventh article the divine and the human phenomena in the life of Christ are declared to be the result of *one divine-human energy*.

The Monophysites of Egypt, Thebes, and Libya, readily accepted the terms of conciliation, rejoicing that the established church had at last come substantially to their own position. But Sophronius, a learned monk, objected to these proceedings, and after he became patriarch of Jerusalem (634) wrote most violently against the Monothelites, and secured their condemnation in a synod of his own bishops. Sergius, seeing that his most earnest efforts to prevent the breaking out of controversy were futile, now wrote to Pope Honorius, representing to him the good service that had been accomplished by the compromise in uniting to the church the great body of Monophysites, and the evil that was likely to flow from the controversy that Sophronius was about to stir up. Honorius sympathized heartily with Heraclius, Sergius, and Cyrus in their efforts to re-unite the church; and spoke contemptuously of the useless subtleties of Sophronius. The controversy now became general.

(2) *Statement of Opposing Views.*

a. The Views of Sergius, Honorius, and the Monothelites. During the early stages of the controversy the term *energy*, and not *will*, was chiefly employed. The shibboleth of Sergius and his party was: "One is the energy of Christ," and this one energy was defined as a "divine-human energy." The employment of the term "energy" was somewhat ambiguous, in that it might mean either the volition or the effects of a volition. This ambiguity was favorable to the irenical purposes of Sergius and Cyrus, inasmuch as all would admit the use of the word in the latter sense. Honorius, having been appealed to by Sergius, entered warmly into the controversy with the distinct assertion of two natures, each working in its own way, but *one will*, which he assigned to the one personality, recognized by Leo and the Council of Chalcedon.[1]

At a later time Honorius advised a discontinuance of the employment of the term "one energy" or "operation," and the substitution of the term "one operator Christ, who works by means of both natures."

Heraclius now issued his "*Ecthesis*" in which the unity of the *will* in Christ is expressly taught, and in which disputes about the unity or the duality of the *energies* are strictly forbidden.[2] In 643 the Emperor Constans finding that the "*Ecthesis*" had failed of its purpose, substituted for it the "*Typos*," in which all controversy with regard either to the energies or the will is prohibited. The unity of will was not given up, but the emperor was weary of controversy, and attempted to repress it by the severest legislation.

---

[1] Hardouin, Vol. III., p. 1319, *seq.*

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 791, *seq.*

b. The Views of Sophronius and the other Dyothelites. Sophronius was the first to oppose the Monothelitic compromise. He insisted that Christ was perfect in deity and perfect in humanity; that he was consubstantial with the Father as God, and consubstantial with his mother and with us as man. These two natures are unconfusedly but inseparably united in one person. This divine-human person, accomplished through the medium of the divine and the human natures the things that belong to deity, and the things that belong to humanity. While maintaining, therefore, the persistent integrity of the divine and the human natures (he does not assert the existence of two *wills*), he practically makes the human nature a passive instrument of the divine-human personality.

The successors of Pope Honorius, John IV., Theodore, and Martin V., repudiated the Monothelitic view of Honorius, and united Northern Africa, Libya, etc., in a politico-religious opposition to the Eastern Empire and to Monothelitism. In 649 a council was held at the Lateran, in which the "*Ecthesis*," the "*Typos*," Sergius, and his successors were anathematized, and the doctrine of *two wills* was distinctly asserted.[1] The ablest defender of the doctrine of the two wills was Maximus, a monk, who was a member of the Lateran Council. In reply to the objections of the Monothelites, that to say that there are two wills is to presuppose that there are two who will, Maximus answered, that the will pertains to the nature and not to the personality, since otherwise there would be three wills in the Holy Trinity. But duality of wills does not involve antagonism; for antagonism could only arise from evil, and there was no evil in Christ. Free-will, or self-determination, Maximus held, is an essential part of human nature. If Christ's human nature had not an independent will, Christ was an imperfect man.

In most of Christ's actions, the two wills, while working independently, arrived at the same results. In some instances we see the working of the divine will alone;

---

[1] Hardouin, Vol. III., p. 687, *seq.*

in others the working of the human will alone, though never antagonistic the one to the other.

The duality of wills in Christ was proved by the Dyothelites from such expressions of Christ, as: "I came from heaven not to do my own will, but the will of the Father which sent me"; "not as I will, but as thou wilt"; "my meat is to do the will of him that sent me," etc.

The third Constantinopolitan Council (680–681), convoked by the Emperor Constantinus Pogonatus, with a view to reuniting the church, and especially to conciliating the Roman See, was directed chiefly by Pope Agathon, whose letter on the person of Christ, addressed to the council, was substantially adopted. The council amended the Symbol of Chalcedon so as to teach explicitly two natural wills, not opposed to each other, but the human will following the divine will, and in subjection thereto. In the one hypostasis of Christ may be discerned his two natures, and by this personality he both performed his miracles and endured his sufferings in such a manner that each of his two natures willed and worked what was proper to it, in conjunction with the other.[1]

(3) *Concluding Remarks.*

a. Thus Dyothelitism triumphed chiefly through the influence of the Roman See, notwithstanding the fact, that Honorius, a Roman pope, was a Monothelite; that a long line of emperors had sustained Monothelitism by argument and by the employment of outward force; that the incumbents of the great Patriarchal Sees of the East were almost all Monothelites; that a Roman pope and the great theologian of the Dyothelites had died as martyrs in banishment; and that thousands of others had suffered for their Dyothelitism.

b. The reasons for the triumph of Dyophysitism were probably the following:

(*a*) The fact that the Christian consciousness required in Christ a perfect manhood. This had been asserted in the earlier controversies; but the existence of two wills, which is involved in the assertion of perfect manhood and perfect deity, had not been explained.

---

[1] Hardouin, Vol. III., p. 1043, *seq.*

(*b*) The Monothelites were, from the beginning, actuated by motives of civil and ecclesiastical policy rather than by a desire to arrive at the truth. The Dyothelites seem to have had more at heart the interests of the truth.

(*c*) The persecuting measures of the Monothelite emperors tended to unite the whole West and a large part of the East in common opposition to tyranny and false doctrine. The cause of the Roman party from the time of the "*Ecthesis*" and the "*Typos*," and especially after the Lateran Synod (649), was the gaining cause.

Thus after four hundred years of controversy on the person of Christ, a formula was arrived at which the great majority of Christians from that time to this have recognized as correct and in accordance with the Scriptures.

5. *The Adoptionist Controversies.*

LITERATURE: Conybeare, "The Key of Truth," 1898 (Introduction and Appendices); writings of the Adoptionists, Elipandus and Felix, in Migne's "*Patrologia Latina*," Vol. XCVI.; writings of the chief opponents of the Western Adoptionists, Beatus, Heterius, Alcuin, Agobardus, and Paulinus, in Migne's "*Patrol. Lat.*," Vols, XCVI., XCIX., C., CI., and CIV.; Walch, "*Hist. Adoptianorum*," 1755; Dorner, "Person of Christ," Div. II., Vol. I., p. 248, *seq.*, Vol. II., p. 338, *seq.*, Vol. III., p. 301, *seq.*; Gams, "*Kirchengesch. von Spanien*," *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 261, *seq.*; Baudissin, "*Eulogius u. Alvar*," *Seit.* 61, *seq.*; Harnack, "*Dogmengesch.*," *Bd.* III., *Seit.* 248, *seq.*; Hauck, "*Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*," *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 256, *seq.*; Grössler, "*Die Ausrottung d. Adoptianismus im Reiche Karls d. Gr.*"; pertinent sections and articles in the manuals of church history and doctrine history, and in the encyclopedias.

(*1*) *Preliminary Remarks.*

In the preceding period reference was made to the wide diffusion, during the second and third centuries, of Adoptionist views of the person of Christ. In many cases, no doubt, the use of Adoptionist language by otherwise orthodox teachers was due to the fact that the doctrine of the person of Christ had not yet been made the subject of exhaustive study, and the logical consequences of such language were not understood; but in other cases (as in that of Theodotus and his followers) Adoptionism was maintained polemically against those who were asserting the absolute deity of Christ.

Reference was also made to the fact that this type of

Christianity was widely propagated in Persia and Armenia through the disciples of Paul of Samosata and otherwise, and that the adherents of this type of teaching in Armenia resisted the intrusion of the teachings of the Greek Church, and when the influence of the latter became dominant persisted as a persecuted party during the Middle Ages, and even to modern times, under the name of "Paulicians." "The Key of Truth," an Armenian writing found in the possession of the modern Paulicians of Thondrak, that embodies the doctrines and practices of the party, contains a most interesting statement of the Adoptionist Christology in a form that Conybeare attributes to the present period. Our Lord Jesus Christ is here represented as first receiving at his baptism the priesthood, the kingdom, and the office of Chief Shepherd.

> Moreover, he was then chosen, then he won lordship, then he became resplendent, then he was strengthened, then he was revered, then he was appointed to guard us, then he was glorified, then he was made glad, then he shone forth, . . then he became chief of beings heavenly and earthly, then he became the light of the world, then he became the way, the truth, and the life. Then he became the door of heaven; then he became the rock impregnable at the gate of hell; then he became the foundation of our faith; then he became Saviour of us sinners; then he became filled with the Godhead; then he was sealed, then anointed; then he was called by the voice; then he became the loved one; then he came to be guarded by angels; then to be the Lamb without blemish. Furthermore, he then put on the primal raiment of light, which Adam lost in the garden. Then, accordingly, was it that he was invited by the Spirit of God to converse with the Heavenly Father; yea, then also was he ordained King of beings in heaven and on earth and under the earth.

This view was held in connection with the acceptance of the supernatural birth of Christ, and involved a recognition of his exaltation to the highest conceivable dignity, glory, and authority.

(2) *The Spanish Controversy.*

a. Source of the Spanish Adoptionism of the Eighth Century. To what extent the Adoptionism of Elipandus, bishop of Toledo (*c.* 780) and his followers was influenced by Mohammedan thought and a desire to present Christianity in a form as acceptable as possible to the cultured Saracens that ruled the country, is a question on which scholars are divided. It is certainly a remarkable fact that Adoptionism in the East (Paulicians) as well as in the West was in very close contact with Mohammedanism, and it is not improbable that in both cases Christian thought was consciously or unconsciously influenced by the enthusiastic monotheism of the Saracens. But it is certain, as already intimated, that Adoptionist modes of expression were widely current in the early Christian centuries, and their persistence till after the Mohammedan conquests is by no means improbable. It may be that the enthusiastic propagandism of Adoptionist views in the eighth century was due to a kindling of the surviving Adoptionism of the older type by contact with the fiercely aggressive monotheistic teaching of the Saracens.

b. Statement of the Adoptionist View. The Spanish Adoptionists of the eighth century, appealing in support of their views to the authority of Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome, Augustine,[1] and Isidore of Seville, maintained (*a*) That the eternal Son of God is to be distinguished from the man Jesus of Nazareth. "Jesus Christ is adoptive in his humanity and by no means adoptive in his divinity." According to his divine nature, he is the true and proper Son of God, and could with propriety say, "I and the Father are one." According to his humanity he is the Son of God, "not by generation, but by adoption; not by nature, but by grace." (*b*) That this adoption of Christ as man sustained a close and necessary relation to the adoption of believers as sons of God. According to his deity he is the "only begotten," according to his humanity he is "the first born among many brethren." Believers are "adoptive with the adoptive one—Christ with Christ." Christ is "a God among gods" (*i. e.*, believers, *cf.* John 10 : 34, *seq.*). The "adoptive members" must have "an adoptive head." (*c*) Great stress is laid upon the baptism of Jesus (as by the Paulicians) as the occasion or means of his adoption, and as absolutely necessary to his mediatorial work.

---

[1] Augustine was at one stage of his development a thorough-going Adoptionist; but he was able to extricate himself from this as from many other erroneous modes of thought.

The Redeemer according to his humanity comprehended in himself two births: "the first, that is to say, which he received from the Virgin by being born, the second, indeed, which he initiated in the bath, by rising from the dead." This coupling of baptism and the resurrection seems to indicate that the process of adoption begun in baptism was consummated in the resurrection. A close connection was supposed between Christ's birth in baptism and the regeneration of believers in baptism.

c. *Polemics against the Adoptionists.* Among the most important opponents of Adoptionism was Alcuin, the great British prelate and educator. The Adoptionists were charged with Nestorianism, inasmuch as they separated the humanity from the deity of Christ so as to postulate two sonships. Christ is not "man" but "the God-man." He is "not in *everything* like us apart from sin," but "in *many things*"—in most things and the most important things he is unlike us. Alcuin even went so far as to deny that Christ prayed for himself or for his disciples. As God-man he could have no need to pray for himself and he was abundantly able to bestow every needed blessing on his disciples; he had no occasion to pray for them. What seem to be prayers were merely for effect. It was insisted that the God-man, as such, is Son of God, not by adoption or by grace, but eternally and by nature.

This controversy extended far into the Middle Ages and may have persisted in some of the sects until the time of the Reformation and later. It is probable that the Christology of the Antiochian school was directly or indirectly influential in the Adoptionist Christology.

IV. ON ANTHROPOLOGY: THE PELAGIAN AND SEMI-PELAGIAN CONTROVERSIES.

LITERATURE: Works of Augustine, Pelagius, Jerome, Marius Mercator, Paulus Orosius, Cassianus, Prosper, Fulgentius, in Migne's "*Patrologia*"; English translation of Augustine's "Anti-Pelagian Writings," with elaborate Introductory Essay by Warfield, in "Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers," Ser. I., Vol. V.; older modern works by Vossius, Garnier, Norisius, Jansenius, Sirmond, Tillemont, Walch, and Geffken; Wiggers, "*Versuch einer pragmat. Darstellung d. Augustinismus u. Pelagianismus*," 1821–1833 (Eng. trans. of Part I., Andover, 1840); Cunningham, "S. Austin and his Place in the History of Christian Thought," 1886; Bindemann, "*Der heilige*

condition of man
What is

Augustinus," 1844–1869; Dorner, "*Augustinus, sein Theol. System u. seine Religionsphilosophische Anschauung*," 1873; Warfield, "Augustine and the Pelagian Controversy," 1897; Reuter, "*Augustinische Studien*," 1887; pertinent sections in the works on the history of doctrine and in the encyclopedias.

371

1. *Antecedents of Augustinianism and Pelagianism.*

Before the beginning of the fifth century the attention of Christian thinkers had never been focused on the great anthropological questions that figure in the Pelagian controversy. Many expressions regarding the original and actual condition of man can be found in the ante-Nicene and the fourth century writings; but they were employed without dogmatic or polemical purpose and are significant as showing the trend of thought rather than as expressing the well-reasoned convictions of the writers.

(1) Writers like *Justin*, *Irenæus*, and *Hippolytus*, in combating Gnostic fatalism were careful to vindicate the freedom of man to obey the divine precepts and to avail himself of the means of salvation graciously provided, and his responsibility for the use or the neglect of the means of grace. They were careful to guard against the Gnostic supposition that the world, including man, is the creature of an imperfect or malignant demiurge, and to insist upon the original goodness of the work of the good Creator; yet they regarded imperfection as inhering in the finiteness of created beings. Because of his limitations man was subject to temptation and liable to fall. Free from evil, but without experience, and susceptible to temptation because of their sensuous nature, our first parents yielded to the solicitations of the tempter. If they had persisted in obedience to God, they would have attained to communion with God and to eternal life. By disobedience they became involved in evil, yet retained freedom of will, the indelible image of God in man.

(2) *Tertullian*, who was inclined to regard the fall as a fearful catastrophe, still insisted most earnestly on freedom of will as an inalienable element of human nature and as constituting in man ability to appropriate the provisions of divine grace. Yet he regarded divine grace as absolutely necessary to man's salvation. He was probably the first to set forth clearly the propagation of

souls together with their good and evil qualities (Traducianism).

(3) *Clement of Alexandria* looked upon the fall as a far less momentous event. Man was created in an infantile state, with his sensuous nature far better developed than his moral and intellectual. By yielding to sensuality he became involved in disobedience to God. Sin consists chiefly in subjection to sensuality. The effect of Adam's sin upon the race was chiefly that of example. Inherited tendency to sin is recognized, but sin as guilt inherent in human nature finds no place in his system. The example and the precepts of Christ he regarded as divinely provided helps whereby man is able to overcome sensuality and to attain to exaltation of character; but not, apparently, as absolutely indispensable to man's salvation.

(4) *Origen* also maintained the freedom of the will and the power of every man to avail himself of the salvation of Christ; yet he accounted for the sinful condition of human souls by the supposition of a fall in a previous state of existence. He seems to have had a somewhat more adequate conception of the sinfulness of human nature and the need of atonement than did Clement; but he laid chief stress on the moral influence of Christ's life and death in the plan of salvation.

(5) *Paul of Samosata* is said to have magnified man's natural ability and to have made little of the special grace of God as a factor in man's salvation. In this as in other respects Arius followed in Paul's footsteps. Regarding Christ as a result of the union of the divine Logos (a created being) with a human body, and supposing that he had attained to his present exalted position by the choice of good when a contrary choice was possible, it was natural for him to lay undue stress on man's ability to follow Christ in this respect. Athanasius understood him to make the higher divine character of Christ dependent on his purely human activity. It was inevitable, therefore, that Arianism should develop a superficial view of sin, redemption, and divine grace. Athanasius was justified in charging Arius with robbing humanity of grace by his separation of the Word from the Father as regards essence and dignity.

(6) *Apollinaris* was almost Manichæan in his conception of the essential evil of human nature. He would not admit that Christ had a complete human nature, for he could not understand how he could in that case have escaped the contagion of sin. As the divine Logos took the place of the human spirit in Christ, so the salvation of believers consists in their likeness to Christ and their imitation of him and not in renewal and restoration (first-fruits). Here also we have an inadequate view of grace in redemption. The appropriation of Christ's salvation is represented as a subjective process of imitation and assimilation, dependent wholly on the will of the individual.

(7) The cordiality with which Pelagians were received in *Antiochian circles* during the early stages of the Pelagian controversy shows the close affinity between the Pelagian and the Antiochian (Nestorian) modes of thought. The emphasis laid by the Nestorians on the persistent integrity of Christ's humanity, including freedom of will, and their utter aversion to any view of Christ's humanity that savored of Docetism, involved a relatively favorable view of the condition of human nature as such. The Augustinian view of man's depravity, lack of freedom, and absolute dependence on special divine grace for deliverance, was distasteful to them; and while they were not prepared to accept the extreme statements of the Pelagian anthropology, it was easy for a shrewd apologist like Julian or Cœlestius to win the approval of men like Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius.

2. *Augustine and Pelagius.*

The [illegible] [illegible]

The temperaments and the experiences of the two protagonists in this controversy no doubt had much to do with the radical differences of their conceptions regarding nature and grace.

(1) *Augustine's* was a tempestuous, passionate nature. Despite his wonderful intellectual power it was with the utmost difficulty that he could keep his body under. The excesses and irregularities of his youth and early manhood were to him a lifelong subject of regret, almost of remorse. His ideas of human depravity were derived from the correspondence of his own experience with

Paul's representation of the antagonism between the flesh and the spirit, between the law of the mind and the law of the members (Rom. 7). His "Confessions" constitutes one of the most remarkable psychological disclosures in all literature and should be read by every one who wishes to sound the depths of human experience in relation to the religious life. His connection with the Manichæans for nine years accustomed him to regarding human nature as fundamentally evil and human freedom as a delusion. Delivered from the thraldom of Manichæism through the medium of Neo-Platonism (Plotinus), he was perilously near to exchanging Manichæan dualism for semi-pantheism, and by contemplating God in his absoluteness to lose sight of the relative freedom of man. Yet, in contending with the Manichæans, he went so far in his assertion of human freedom as greatly to embarrass him in his controversy with the Pelagians.

(2) *Pelagius*, on the other hand, was a learned monk of cold, even temperament, and of abstemious life. To him it seemed easy to live uprightly. He was conscious of freedom to perform the dictates of his higher nature. He saw no need of supposing that Adam's posterity had inherited his guilt. To him man seemed fully equipped by nature for living a life of righteousness by the use of such helps as have been graciously provided by God and are available in some measure to all.

The early tradition that Pelagius was born in Britain and that his views of Christianity were tinctured with the naturalism of the Druids may rest on a foundation of fact. Yet we find him perfectly at home among the Latin theologians of Italy, North Africa, and Gaul, and among the Greek theologians of the East. It seems probable that he had resided for many years in these regions before we meet him in Rome, about 400. It is difficult to conceive that a man brought up in Britain and reaching middle life there should have been so completely at home in the great centers of Christian life as he seems at that time to have been. He enjoyed the friendship of Paulinus of Nola, and of Sulpicius Severus, the great promoters of ascetic life, and for a time that of Jerome. He was highly honored because of his learning and the purity of his life.

3. *Rise of the Controversy.*

Pelagius was strongly averse to controversy. It was his more aggressive disciple Cœlestius, a Roman lawyer of noble birth, who having been won over by him to the ascetic life, presented his teaching in polemical form and precipitated the great conflict with Augustine. Pelagius and Cœlestius had taken refuge in North Africa at the time of Alaric's invasion of Italy (411), and Pelagius had formed a pleasant acquaintance with Augustine, bishop of Hippo. Cœlestius sought admission to the Carthaginian ministry. From Italy the Carthaginians were warned of his doctrinal unsoundness. In a Carthaginian synod he defended the Pelagian teachings. That which awakened most opposition was the implication that infant baptism was unnecessary to salvation. This view was involved in his denial of original or hereditary sin. He sought to satisfy his opponents by allowing that infant baptism admitted to the kingdom of God, though eternal life did not depend upon it. The controversy thus begun soon spread throughout Christendom.

37

4. *Statement of the Views of the Contending Parties.*

(1) *The Views of the Pelagians.* Pelagius and his chief coadjutors, Cœlestius and Julian, did not always express themselves consistently. Their extreme desire to vindicate their orthodoxy often led them to make partial, compromising statements. There has been considerable diversity of opinion among modern writers as to which point of Pelagius' teaching is to be regarded as fundamental. Some give the primacy to the doctrine of free will, others to denial of original sin, others to the denial of the necessity of infant baptism, others to the maintenance of the natural necessity of physical death, others still to the superficial view of sin. The fact is, that from either of these positions all the rest of the features of the system can be logically derived. If we must choose one principle as most fundamental, that of the freedom of the will seems to have the advantage.

a. Freedom of the Will. Pelagius maintained that man was created with perfect freedom to choose between good and evil, and that this freedom inheres in every man at all times.

> We contradict the Lord when we say "it is hard," "it is difficult," "we cannot," "we are men," "we are encompassed with mortal flesh." Oh, blind nonsense! Oh, unholy audacity! We

> charge God with a two-fold ignorance: that he does not seem to know what he has made, nor what he has commanded; just as if he, forgetting the human weakness of which himself is the author, has imposed laws on man which he cannot endure.[1] In this capacity for a two-fold choice . . . lies the superiority of the rational soul. In this consists the honor of our nature; in this its dignity.[2] The rational creature has the advantage over all others in this, that while the latter have only a goodness of condition and of necessity, the former alone has it of will.[3] Sin that is necessary is not sin at all. Man is neither good nor evil because he is free; but neither could he be good or evil unless he were free.[4] It is easier to avoid parricide and sacrilege and adultery, or like things, than to commit them.[5] Free will after sins have been committed is just as complete as it was before.[6]

b. Sin. Closely connected with the doctrine of free will was the Pelagians' doctrine of sin. Sin is purely a matter of will. Adam sinned by the exercise of his free will. Most of his posterity have sinned after his example, but not all. To assert the heredity of sin involved, in their opinion, the acceptance of the theory of the propagation of the soul (Traducianism), which they regarded as materialistic and horrible. Each soul is created pure and has as perfect freedom to do good or evil as Adam had. If sin is a man's own, it is voluntary; if it is voluntary, it can be avoided.

> "What then is sin?" wrote Julian. "It is the appetency of free will for what justice prohibits . . . the will to do what justice forbids and what there is freedom to abstain from. . . Does God impute what he knows cannot be avoided?[7] God . . . does not make evil: a little child before the decision of his own will has nothing save what God made in him. Naturally, therefore, there can be in him no sin."[8] Sin is represented by Julian as having its origin in one's own appetite.[9]

c. Infant Baptism. As remarked above, the implied needlessness of infant baptism was at first the chief ground on which Pelagius and his disciples were attacked. Denying hereditary sin they were unable to find any adequate justification for this practice. Yet they were not sufficiently interested in anti-pedobaptism to be willing to make it a plank in their platform.

---

[1] "*Ep. ad Demetr.*," Chap. 19.
[2] *Ibid.*, Chap. 2.
[3] *Ibid.*, Chap. 3.
[4] Augustine, "*Op. Imp.*," Bk. V., Chap. 57.
[5] Julian, in "*Op. Imp.*," Bk. III., Chap. 111.
[6] *Ibid.*, Bk. I., Chap. 91.
[7] Augustine, "*Op. Imp.*," Bk. V., Chap. 28.
[8] Julian, in "*Op. Imp.*," Bk. V., Chap. 63.
[9] "*Op. Imp.*," Bk. I., Chap. 44, *seq.*

[illegible]

in the [illegible]

Pelagians admitted that baptism might properly be administered to infants with the use of the regular ritual for older people. Pelagius went so far as to denounce the refusal of baptism to infants as godlessness. He had heard one heretic so wicked as to deny that infants should be baptized.[1] Infants answer truly through their sponsors that they believe in the forgiveness of sins, meaning the sins of those who are guilty. Julian insisted that "the grace of baptism" was "useful to all ages," and "would smite with an eternal anathema all who do not think it necessary even for little children."[2] He thought that by the grace of baptism "a sinner from a wicked becomes a perfectly good man; but an innocent person who has no evil of his own will, becomes from a good a better person, that is, the best. Both indeed become members of Christ by baptism; only the one had before led a wicked life, the other was of an uncorrupted nature." By baptism, he maintained, we become children of God and members of his kingdom.[3] Pelagius distinguished between *eternal life*, which belongs to unbaptized infants, and the *kingdom of heaven* in which only the baptized participate.

d. Divine Grace. Pelagius and his followers used the expression "divine grace" to include the fact of our creation, of our being alive, of our being rational, of our being in the image of God, of our possessing free will, of our enjoying God's unceasing beneficence, of our having the divine law given us in the Old Testament, and above all the fact of our enjoyment of the teachings, the example, and the sufferings of the incarnate Son.[4] They maintained that salvation is possible without law or gospel and was attained by some before the giving of the law; that it was easier to attain under the law; and that the gospel dispensation greatly facilitates its attainment.

(2) *Augustine's Views.* Augustine's position in this controversy was exceedingly embarrassing. In opposition to Manichæan fatalism he felt obliged to insist upon such a degree of freedom as would furnish a basis for human responsibility, and over against the Manichæan doctrine of the absolute and essential evil of human nature he felt obliged to maintain that it was not utterly corrupt. He held with Pelagius, against the Manichæans, that all nature is good, because it proceeds from God.

a. Man's Original State and His Possibilities. Man came from the hand of his Maker faultless. He possessed freedom to do good, reason to know God, and the grace of God. By the latter he means that supernatural assistance whereby alone men and angels could have persevered in goodness. To man, as a moral being, the possibility of sinning was necessary, but sinning only possible. If he had persevered in obedience he would have attained to a state in which sinning would have been impossible. His bodily nature, mortal in itself, would thus have become immortal.

---

[1] "*De Gratia Christi*," Chap. 32; "*De Pec. Orig.*," Chap. 18.

[2] "*Op. Imp.*," Bk. I., Chap. 53, *seq.*

[3] *Ibid.*, Bk. V., Chap. 9.

[4] "*Op. Imp.*," Bk. II., Chap. 94; I., 146.

Justifi[illegible]

b. The Fall. This consisted in the fact that the original possibility of sinning became by willful disobedience a reality. Augustine attributes the fall to the seductive influence of the serpent, who inspired pride and self-seeking first in the woman as the weaker. The sin was committed before the fruit was eaten. The consequences of the fall are: loss of freedom of choice (in matters pertaining to salvation), a beclouding of the mind, loss of the grace of God for performing the good that his freedom willed, loss of paradise, subjection to concupiscence (including all sensuous obstacles to the dominance of the spirit), and physical death.

c. Hereditary Sin. Augustine maintained that the condition of Adam after the fall is the condition of the race. To the end of his life he was greatly perplexed regarding the origin of the soul. The Traducian theory, with which the Pelagians never wearied of reproaching him, claiming as they did that it was logically involved in his doctrine of hereditary guilt, seemed too materialistic to harmonize with his Platonizing mode of thinking. The Creation theory seemed, as was insisted upon in season and out of season by the Pelagians, irreconcilable with his doctrine of original sin, or else with the goodness of God. In his "Retractations" he confessed his ignorance on this point, but insisted that Adam was the representative and the progenitor of the race, and that in Adam all sinned. He felt the need of Traducianism, but could not bring himself openly to adopt it.

d. Baptism. By baptism the guilt of this original sin is taken away, but not sin itself. Unconscious infants dying without baptism are damned by virtue of their inherited guilt. The sinful nature remains after baptism and with the dawn of moral consciousness actual sin appears in the choice of evil through the dominance of concupiscence. This post-baptismal sin will inevitably lead to eternal perdition if it be not healed by penance, by good works, and by the intercession of the glorified Saviour. The real conversion of the will by divine grace, so that it becomes free for goodness, is independent of baptism and usually comes long after the latter has been received. In such conversion of the will grace manifests itself in revelation and teaching and in the inbreathing of the divine love.

e. Divine Grace. Augustine maintained that special divine grace was freely given to our first parents in such measure as would have enabled them to persevere in obedience. To fallen man it is absolutely necessary to his willing or doing good, it is unmerited, and it is irresistible. He conceived of all mankind as, on account of Adam's fall, "a certain mass of sin (or of corruption), amenable to the divine and supreme justice; whether this punishment is exacted or remitted, no injustice is done." Out of this indistinguishable mass God brings some to salvation and allows others to become reprobates. The very willing to secure salvation is a gift of God withheld from some, whom he makes "vessels of contumely"; not that he is the author of sin, but those from whom grace is withheld become vessels of dishonor and contribute to the harmony of the divine system.

f. Predestination, Election, Perseverance, and Reprobation. Augustine taught that with fallen humanity in mind God "justly predestined to punishment" (or death) a part of the race, while some "he benignantly predestined to grace, not because we were holy, but that we might be." He maintained the final perseverance of the elect, but admitted that election could be known in individual cases only from observation of perseverance to the end. He did not distinctly teach that God determined to create man in order that all the race might become involved in sin and that he might save some by his grace and damn others for the manifestation of his justice (Supralapsarianism), though he comes perilously near to this conception in making the existence and the punishment of evil beings essential to the harmony of the divine scheme.

4. *Proceedings Against the Pelagians.*

(1) *Synods at Jerusalem and Diospolis.* After his condemnation by a Carthaginian synod (412) Pelagius visited Palestine, where he won the confidence of Bishop John of Jerusalem. Jerome, the opponent of John (see Origenistic controversies above), who had been informed by Augustine, through the presbyter Orosius, of Pelagius' errors, wrote a sharp polemic against him. Pelagius succeeded in stating his views in a Jerusalem synod to the satisfaction of John, who bade Pelagius keep quiet until the bishop of Rome could be heard from on the matter. Further attacks from the West led to a fresh investigation in a synod at Diospolis (Lydda) under Bishop Eulogius of Cæsarea. On this occasion Pelagius declined to be held responsible for the teachings of Cœlestius and by sophistical modes of statement gained the recognition of the body.

(2) *Popes Innocent I. and Zosimus.* At the instance of the African bishops, Innocent I. condemned Pelagius (416). Innocent's death occurring shortly afterward, Cœlestius was able to convince his successor of the orthodoxy of the Pelagians. Zosimus rebuked the Africans for listening to slanderous reports against these excellent men. The African bishops declined to withdraw their condemnation until Pelagius and Cœlestius should unequivocally assert "that the grace of God by Jesus Christ assists us not only to the knowledge, but also to the exercise, of righteousness in every single act, so that without it we should be able to think, to say, or to perform nothing truly pious or holy."

In 418 a General Council of the African churches condemned the chief positions of the Pelagians, and Zosimus of Rome felt constrained to withdraw his support and caused their condemnation in a Roman synod. Julian, bishop of Eclanum, refused to accept the decision of the synod and was henceforth by far the most acute and courageous defender of Pelagian principles. It was in controversy with him that Augustine wrote his most important anti-Pelagian works. In these are incorporated Julian's statements and arguments that would otherwise have perished. This controversy with Julian was the occasion of Augustine's working out with great fullness his doctrines of freedom of will, sin, grace, predestination, etc.

(3) *Pelagians and Nestorians.* Pelagius seems to have remained in the East and is soon lost sight of. Julian and Cœlestius again sought and won the support of such Oriental bishops as Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius. The fall of Nestorius (see Nestorian controversy above) rendered his approval worse than useless, and they were condemned along with him by the Synod of Ephesus (431).

5. *The Semi-Pelagians.*

(1) *Jerome, Prosper, Vincentius, and Cassianus.* The Pelagians had failed signally to win Christendom to the acceptance of their views. Augustine and his adherents had industriously discredited them wherever they sought to introduce their teachings.

But neither was Augustinianism to be the dominant theology of the age. As it was radically different from the theology of the past, so it was out of accord with the dominant tendencies of the immediately succeeding time. Luther and Calvin were the true successors of Augustine. His own age was not ripe for his teachings. He laid too much stress on the inner Christian life and too little stress on external ceremonies to suit the spirit of the age. While he held that baptism destroys the guilt of original sin, he repudiated the thought that, apart from special divine grace working a change in the direction of the will and producing righteous character, salvation is possible to those that reach moral consciousness. He was an earnest advocate of asceticism, but he denied that the mere torture of the flesh, apart from the transformation of the life into Christlikeness, avails anything. He regarded the Supper as a "communion of the body of Christ," yet he did not admit that the mere eating and drinking of the elements were of any benefit apart from the faith of the partaker. He taught the perseverance of the saints, but he denied that any one could be assured of the possession of the gift of perseverance until the end of life. His teachings were radically opposed to the sacramentalism and to the idea of salvation by external works that more and more dominated the Christian thought of the time.

Even Jerome, who joined with Augustine in condemning the Pelagians, was far from being an Augustinian. Prosper of Aquitania and Hilary of Arles remonstrated with Augustine regarding the rigor of his predestinarianism. Vincentius of Lerins (434) put forth a vigorous, though covert, attack on Augustine's teachings, laying stress on ecclesiastical traditionalism and insisting that the greatest care should be taken that "we hold fast to what has been believed everywhere, always, and by all" (*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*). These Gallic opponents of Augustine insisted on the recognition of such a degree of free will as would make each man's salvation dependent on himself. "All who perish, perish against the will of God" (Cassianus).

(2) *The "Prædestinatus" and Faustus of Lerins.* About 450 appeared an anonymous work called "*Prædestinatus*," in which the doctrine of predestination was set forth with the utmost harshness. "Those whom God has once predestinated to life, even if they are negligent, even if they sin, even if they are unwilling, yet unwillingly are conducted to life; but those whom he has predestinated to death, even if they run, even if they hasten, labor in vain." The immoral and almost blasphemous teachings of this book aroused the polemical zeal of many earnest Christian thinkers.

Faustus, abbot of Lerins, who represented the moderate anti-Augustinianism of the Gallic monks, attacked extreme Augustinianism with great vigor. He denounced "the error of predestination," defended "the free choice of the human mind," and identified the current predestinarian doctrine with pagan and Manichæan fatalism. He does not attack Augustine, but aims his blows at the later somewhat exaggerated Augustinianism. While admitting that holiness cannot be attained without divine grace, he made great claims for the efficacy of asceticism in elevating character.

(3) *The Scythian Monks and Fulgentius.* About 519 some Scythian monks residing in Constantinople began to agitate in favor of Augustinianism and pressed upon Pope Hormisdas the utter inconsistency of his recognizing

both Augustine and Faustus as orthodox. One or the other must be a heretic. This led Fulgentius, an African theologian, to defend the doctrine of predestination against Faustus' assaults; yet he rejected the idea of predestination to sin (reprobation).

(4) *Mediæval Orthodoxy as fixed by Gregory the Great.* After much controversy Semi-Pelagianism was seemingly vanquished, but the dominant type of Roman Catholic theology, as embodied in the works of Pope Gregory the Great (590–604), was not Augustinianism, although much of the language of Augustine was freely used; but rather the ascetic theology of Jerome, modified by the deepening asceticism and formalism of the fully developed hierarchical church.

V. CONTROVERSIES OCCASIONED BY PROTESTS AGAINST THE PROGRESSIVE PAGANIZATION OF CHRISTIAN LIFE AS SEEN IN ASCETICISM, THE VENERATION OF SAINTS AND RELICS, ETC.

Long before the close of the fourth century the ascetical view of Christian life, already aggressive at the beginning of the present period, had become dominant. The religious life was identified with asceticism. The perfection of Christian character could be approximated only by voluntary celibacy, poverty, and withdrawal from secular life.

Martin of Tours (d. *c.* 400) established a monastery at Poictiers (*c.* 367), where he practised the most rigorous asceticism and acquired the reputation of being a miracle worker. Sulpicius Severus, a Gallic nobleman of character and culture, became his enthusiastic disciple and biographer. He attributed to his master the raising of the dead (several cases), the stopping of a falling tree, the arrest of the progress of a fire, the healing of demoniacs and lepers, etc. As bishop of Tours he founded a multitude of churches and greatly extended the influence of Christianity in Gaul. Sulpicius employed the revenues of his great estates and his personal influence in the promotion of ascetical Christianity.

Paulinus of Nola, an Italian noble of enormous wealth and elegant culture (he has been designated "the Christian Cicero"), became a Christian and adopted the ascetical life (*c*. 379). He devoted his income to charity and the founding of a church and a monastery in which relics and images of saints and martyrs were collected and where a truly pagan cult was established. He spent much of his time prostrate before the image of St. Felix, his patron saint, and every year wrote a birthday poem in his honor,—bestowing on him epithets suitable only for Deity, attributing to his favor the blessings of life, and imploring his good offices for the future. The influence of Martin, Sulpicius, and Paulinus, was widespread. Christian churches became assimilated to pagan temples and the ascetical life grew apace.

Jerome (*c*. 341–420), the greatest scholar of his age, was mastered by the ascetical spirit (*c*. 372), and to escape hell and expiate his sins betook himself to the deserts of Syria, where he lived a life of incredible austerity, waging meantime the fiercest battle with his passions. After four years of the most rigorous hermit life and a brief residence at Antioch, he returned to Rome, where (*c*. 382) he found the church in the most shameful disorder on account of a disputed succession to the episcopal chair. Here he promoted ascetical life, especially among women of rank, and established such intimate relations with two young widows, Paula and Marcella, as to awaken grave, but probably unjust, suspicions. In 385 he left Rome, which he now called "Babylon," to take up his abode in Bethlehem, where he prepared his edition of the Latin Bible (Vulgate) and wrote many of his controversial and other works. He was a fanatic of the most pronounced type and was one of the most violent and unscrupulous polemicists of the age. He composed fabulous lives of early ascetics (Antony, Paul, Malchus, and Hilarion), in which he drew freely upon the erotic pagan romances of the earlier time and thought only of exalting the most extreme forms of asceticism. He carried on an extensive correspondence with the leading Christians of all parts of the world and exerted a profound influence in favor of world-flight and celibacy.

A milder and more rational type of asceticism was represented and fostered in Syria and Asia Minor by Basil (d. 379), Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Diodorus (d. 394), Chrysostom (d. 407), Nestorius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, etc., and in Italy and Africa by Ambrose (d. 397) and Augustine (d. 430). From the writings of these latter it is evident that the ascetical spirit had become dominant, and they were concerned to guard against its abuses and to insist upon the possibility and the duty of true Christian morality in secular life.

Closely connected with the growth of asceticism was the rapid development of the most groveling idolatry—worship of saints, relics, images, holy places, etc.

It was against the corrupt practices and corrupting tendencies indicated above that the protests occasioning the following controversies were uttered.

1. *The Aërian Controversy.*

LITERATURE: Epiphanius, "*Panarion*" ("*Haeres.*," 75), Walch, "*Hist. d. Ketzereien*," *Bd.* III., *Seit.* 321, *seq.*; Neander, "Ch. Hist.," Vol. II., p. 342, *seq.*; encyclopedia articles.

Aërius, presbyter and superintendent of a Christian almshouse at Sebaste, Asia Minor, was intimately associated with Eustathius, who became bishop *c.* 355. Controversy regarding the administration of the institution arose between Aërius and the bishop, and the former was obliged to resign his position *c.* 360. A large number of the constituents of the diocese supported Aërius, who vigorously attacked not only the personal administration of Eustathius, but the corruptions in doctrine and practice that were coming to prevail in that region. He accused Eustathius of being too much concerned about the acquisition of property, insisted upon the equality of presbyters and bishops on scriptural grounds, denounced the practice of seeking the intercession of departed saints and of celebrating the Supper as an offering for the dead, opposed the laws regulating fasts (fixed seasons), and especially the celebration of the Passover, which he regarded as a Judaizing practice out of place in a Christian church. He charged the dominant form of Christianity with substituting the bondage of Jewish legalism for the liberty of the gospel.

Driven from the churches and severely persecuted, Aërius and his followers were soon widely scattered. They were obliged to hold their meetings in fields, forests, and in mountainous retreats. They were soon lost sight of as a distinct party; but it is probable that the spirit of their protest persisted in Paulicianism, or rather that it formed part of the early evangelical movement which became prominent in Paulicianism at a later date.

2. *The Jovinianist Controversy.*

LITERATURE: Jerome, "*Adversus Jovinianum*" (Eng. tr. in "Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers," Ser. 2, Vol. VI.); Augustine, "*Haeres.*," 82, "*De Bono Conjugali*," and "*De Virginitate*"; Lindner, "*De Joviniano et Vigilantio Purioris Doctrinæ Antesignanis*," 1839; Schaff, "Ch. Hist." Vol. III., p. 226, *seq.*; Neander, "Ch. Hist.," Vol. II., p. 269, *seq.*; Walch, "*Hist. der Ketzereien*," *Bd.* III., *Seit.* 635, *seq.*; Zöckler, "*Hieronymus*," *Seit.* 194, *seq.*; Comba, "*I Nostri Protestanti*," Vol. I., pp. 85–114; Belling, "*Ueber Jovinian*" (in *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*," *Bd.* IX., *Seit.* 391, *seq.*); encyclopedia articles.

(1) *Rise of the Controversy.* Jovinianus, whom Neander calls "the Protestant of his time," a well-educated Roman monk, began (*c.* 378) to assail the ascetical teachings and practices represented by Jerome and his party. Up to this time he had practised a rigorous asceticism. Jerome represents him as allowing himself more liberty henceforth and even hints at Epicurean indulgence; but there seems no reason to believe that he exceeded the limits of sane Christian living. Augustine finds no fault with his life, but accuses him of Stoicism in putting all sins on a parity and of denying the perpetual virginity of Mary. In this last particular Jovinian followed in the footsteps of Helvidius, whom Jerome had a few years before (*c.* 383) elaborately confuted ("*Adv. Helvidium*").

(2) *Points at Issue.* We are indebted for most of our information regarding the protest of Jovinianus to Jerome, who ascribes to him, apparently in his own language, four "venomous" propositions in which he hears "the hissing of the serpent." These are as follows: *a.* That "virgins, widows, and married women, who have been once washed in Christ, if they do not differ in respect to other works, are of the same merit."

b. That "those who have been baptized cannot be tempted (elsewhere "subverted") by the devil." He defined his meaning by saying: "But those who have been tempted are shown to have been baptized by water only and not by the Spirit, as we read in the case of Simon Magus." Jerome further states Jovinian's position thus: "He denies that those who with full faith have obtained baptism can thenceforth sin." Elsewhere[1] Jerome represents Jovinianus as saying: "That those who with full faith have obtained baptism cannot be tempted; nay, in other words, that a baptized man, if he be unwilling to sin, sins no further." That he did not mean to teach that the truly regenerate man is of necessity absolutely sinless is evident from the statement attributed to him by Jerome: "Between that brother who had always been with the Father, and him who as a penitent was afterward received, there is no diversity." It is probable that he meant simply to teach that sufficient divine grace is bestowed upon the truly regenerate man to enable him to resist the temptations of the evil one, and that such a one will inevitably persevere to the end.

Jovinianus seems to have attached no importance to mere water baptism, and to have regarded baptism as the outward symbol of the inner transformation wrought through faith. Like the Christian writers of the second century, he probably regarded it as the completion of the process of regeneration conditioning the remission of sins.

c. That "there is no difference between those that abstain from foods and those that partake of them with thanksgiving." He argued that "all things were created to serve for the use of mortal men," and appealed to the example of Christ, who was called a "winebibber and a glutton." He repudiated the idea that starvation conduces to holiness.

d. That "to all who shall have preserved their baptism (*i. e.*, have been baptized on a profession of saving faith and hence do not fall away) there is one remuneration in the kingdom of heaven." He insisted that "Christ dwells in all equally and is in us without any difference of degrees. . . So also we are in Christ without degrees." Believers are "a temple of God, not temples."

---

[1] "*Dial. cum Pelagianis,*" Bk. II., chap. 24.

He divided mankind rigorously into two classes, the saved and the unsaved, and refused to allow that there is any distinction to be made among the saved. Salvation being of grace and not of merit, all who are saved are saved absolutely. In these statements Jovinianus was protesting against the current teaching regarding works of supererogation, whereby saints and martyrs were supposed to be able efficaciously to intercede for sinners.

Jerome devotes the first half of his treatise to the refutation of the first proposition, insisting that in the parable of the sower the thirty-fold, sixty-fold, and hundred-fold fruitage of the seed sown in good ground indicates the relative merit of married life, voluntary widowhood, and virginity. Marriage is recommended by Paul not because it is good, but because it is less bad than consuming lust. He is able to quote much Scripture in favor of his contention that there are among Christians differences in spiritual attainment, and that the rewards of the saved and the sufferings of the lost are graded according to desert. If Jovinianus is correctly represented by Jerome and Augustine, he was certainly at fault in insisting upon absolute equality as regards rewards and punishments, which his opponents were probably right in attributing to the Stoic philosophy.

(3) *Proceedings and Results.* That the protest of Jovinianus awakened great interest and received influential support is evident from the excited polemics of Jerome, and from the public proceedings that were instituted against him in Rome and Milan. In 390 a Roman synod under Bishop Siricius condemned him, along with seven of his adherents, and notified other bishops of the fact. A Milanese synod under Ambrose excommunicated the Jovinianists shortly afterward. Jerome in his writing against Vigilantius (406) refers to the death of Jovinianus. An edict of the Emperor Honorius (412) condemns one Jovinianus, who had been holding unauthorized conventicles in the neighborhood of Rome, to scourging and banishment; but if Jerome's statement and the dates of both documents are correct another Jovinianus must be supposed. The persistence of the influence of Jovinianus is seen in the movement led by Vigilantius. It is not unlikely that followers of Jovinianus took refuge in the Alpine Valleys, and there kept alive the evangelical teaching that was to reappear with vigor in the twelfth century (Arnoldists, Petrobrusians, Henricians, etc.).

3. *The Vigilantian Controversy.*

LITERATURE: Jerome, "*Ep. ad Vigilantium*" and "*Adv. Vigilantium*" (Eng. tr. in "Nicene and Post-Nic. Fathers," Ser. 2., Vol. VI.); Lindner, "*De Joviniano et Vigilantio*"; Schmidt, "*Vigilantius, sein Verhältnis zum heil. Hieronymus,*" 1860; Zöckler, "*Hieronymus,*" *Seit.* 303, *seq.*; Lea, "Sacerdotal Celibacy," 2d ed., p. 70, *seq.*; Gilly, "Vig. and his Times"; Neander, "Ch. Hist.," Vol. II., p. 313, *seq.*; 373, *seq.*; Schaff, "Ch. Hist.," Vol. III., p. 226, *seq.*; encyclopedia articles.

(1) *Sketch of Vigilantius.* Vigilantius was a native of Gaul and was a dependent of Sulpicius Severus, who discerning his capabilities liberated and educated him. He was ordained presbyter about 390. Four years later he was sent by his patron to visit the great ascetics of Italy and the East. He spent some time with Paulinus of Nola (see above), who received him with the utmost kindness, and became warmly attached to him. He seems from the first to have been somewhat shocked by the introduction of so much of paganism into Christian worship as he saw at Nola. A visit to Jerome at Bethlehem intensified his aversion to the excesses of asceticism, and he felt constrained to argue the matter with this impetuous and intolerant ascetic. He journeyed thence to Egypt, and became familiar with the most repulsive features of monastic life through contact with the swarms of ascetics who inhabited the Nitrian desert. The fact that in Palestine and in Egypt the Origenistic controversy was raging so furiously at the time no doubt contributed to his dislike for asceticism. It is probable that he had already become familiar with the protest of Jovinianus through the reading of Jerome's polemic or otherwise. On his homeward journey he seems to have visited Milan and Alpine Italy, and no doubt came into direct touch with the Jovinianist movement.

By this time he had become thoroughly convinced that asceticism and idolatrous practices of every kind are foreign to the spirit of Christianity, and he returned to Gaul full of zeal for the restoration of apostolic doctrine and practice. His reforming views found much acceptance, Sulpicius Severus and the bishop of Toulouse at first expressing approval. Jerome, however, was soon in the field with a most virulent and scurrilous polemic.

and the forces of the hierarchy were soon arrayed against him.

(2) *Views of Vigilantius.* In general they were identical with those of Jovinianus; but he did not concern himself with doctrinal matters so much as with the moral results of the ascetical and idolatrous practices that were coming to dominate the churches. From Jerome's exaggerated statement we can best ascertain where the emphasis was placed in his protest:

He charges him with denying "that religious reverence is to be paid to the tombs of the martyrs. Vigils, he says, are to be condemned; *Alleluia* must never be sung except at Easter; continence is a heresy; chastity a hotbed of lust." He spoke contemptuously of relics of the martyrs as "the mysterious something or other which you (Jerome and the ascetics) carry about in a little vessel and worship," and as "a bit of powder wrapped up in a costly cloth in a tiny vessel." Jerome insists that so long as the devil and demons wander freely through the world martyrs are not to be kept shut up in a coffin. Vigilantius maintained that "so long as we are alive we can pray for one another; but once we die, the prayer of no person for another can be heard." Jerome insists that apostles and martyrs can intercede more efficaciously now than when they were encumbered with the flesh and their own sufferings. Vigilantius charged that the vigils at the tombs of saints were the occasion of the grossest immorality on the part of the men and women who participated in them. Jerome admits the fact, but denies that a good thing should be disused because of abuses. He denounced indiscriminate almsgiving, especially for the support of idle monks. He regarded world-flight as cowardly: "This is not to fight, but to run away. Stand in line of battle, put on your armor and resist your foes, so that, having overcome, you may wear the crown." Jerome confesses his cowardice: "I would not fight in the hope of victory, lest some time or other I lose the victory. If I flee, I avoid the sword; if I stand, I must either overcome or fall. But what need is there to let go certainties and follow after uncertainties? . . . You who fight may either be overcome or may overcome. I who fly do not overcome, inasmuch as I fly; but I fly to make sure that I may not be overcome."

(3) *Fate of the Movement.* The movement was lost in the invasion of the Alans and Vandals; but as we find early in the Middle Ages evangelical bodies of Christians in Southern Gaul, it is somewhat probable that the influence of Vigilantius persisted to some extent during the intervening time.

4. *The Paulician Controversy.*

LITERATURE: Peter Siculus, "*Historia Manichæorum*"; Photius, "*Adversus Recentiores Manichæos*" (in Wolf's "*Anec. Gr.*," Vol. I., II.); also numerous casual notices in "*Bibliotheca Scr. Byzantinorum*," ed. Niebuhr; Gieseler, "Ch. Hist.," Vol. II., p. 21, *seq.*, 231, *seq.*, 611, *seq.*, 622, and "*Studien u. Kritiken*," 1829; Neander, Vol. III., pp. 244–267 and 587; Gibbon, "Dec. and Fall," Chap. 54; Finlay, "Hist. of Greece," Vol. II., pp. 168, 243–245, Vol. III., pp. 47, 64, *seq.*, 83; Herzog, "*Kirchengesch.*," *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 22, *seq.*; Hergenröther, *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 524, *seq.*; Joh. Ozniensis, "*Opera*," ed. Aucher, 1834; Gelzer, "*Die Anfänge der Armenischen Kirche*," 1895; Friedrich, "*Bericht über d. Paulikianer*" (*Sitzungsberichte d. k. b. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu München*, 1896). The above works, valuable as regards the external history of the movement, have been almost superseded by the following in respect to the doctrines and practices of the body: Karapet Ter-Mkrttschian, "*Die Paulikianer im Byzantinischen Kaiserreiche und verwandte Erscheinungen in Armenien*," 1893, and Conybeare, "The Key of Truth. A Manual of the Paulician Church of Armenia. The Armenian Text, Edited and Translated with Illustrative Documents and Introduction," 1898. The former of these scholars, an Armenian priest educated in Germany, has thoroughly discredited the accounts of the Paulicians given by Peter Siculus and Photius, and by the monk Georgius, without being able to reach any important positive results; the latter, the foremost English authority on Armenian church history, has brought to light the manual of the ancient Paulician Christians, which has continued in use to recent times, and has given in his Introduction and Appendices much important documentary material not hitherto available.

(1) *Rise of the Paulicians.* The representation of the monkish chronicler Georgius, Peter Siculus, and Photius, that the Paulicians arose in the latter half of the seventh century and had for their founder one Constantine, who having received a copy of the New Testament from a Christian returning from captivity among the Saracens, was greatly interested by the Pauline Epistles and resolved as far as in him lay to secure a restoration of Christianity to its primitive Pauline form, may have

had a basis of fact in the reforming labors of an evangelical leader of that time. But the efforts of these writers to fasten upon the Paulicians the stigma of Manichæan (or Marcionitic) dualism were doubtless due to the unscrupulous polemical methods of the time, in accordance with which the most damaging heresies might legitimately be attributed to theological opponents. A careful comparison of the "Key of Truth," which contains an account of the doctrines and practices of the Paulicians from about the eighth century onward, with the Adoptionist literature of the second century, seems to establish the fact that Paulicianism is a perpetuation of the form of Christianity that was first introduced into Armenia and represents a very early type of doctrine and practice. Reference has already been made in another section to the Adoptionist Christology of the "Key of Truth" and to the fact that Adoptionism is known to have been the prevailing type of Christology in Persia and Armenia during the early centuries. Paulicianism was not so much an attempt to introduce in Armenia a new form of Christianity as a struggle against the encroachments of the Greek Christology, with its accompanying Mariolatry, saint-worship, iconolatry, asceticism, intolerance, and moral corruption.

The name *Pauliciani* was probably derived not from Paul the apostle, but from Paul of Samosata, deposed from the bishopric of Antioch by a synod for teaching Adoptionist Christology in 269 and forced to relinquish his charge by the Emperor Aurelian in 272. This is the representation of Gregory Magistros (eleventh century) and of the Escurial Fragment, from which Photius, Peter Siculus, etc., drew their materials. This document represents Paul's mother as a Manichæan and thus accounts for the supposed Manichæan features of Paulicianism. But even if we could be sure of this derivation of the name, this would constitute no proof that the form of Christianity that came to be thus stigmatized had its origin at this late date.

Conybeare is probably justified in asserting that "the Paulician Church was not the national church of a particular race, but an old form of the apostolic church, and that it included within itself Syrians, Greeks, Armenians, Africans, Latins, and various other races. Finding refuge in southeastern Armenia, when it was nearly extirpated in the Roman Empire, it there nursed its forces in comparative security under the protection of the Persians and Arabs, and prepared itself for that magnificent career of missionary enterprise in the Greek world, which the sources relate with so much bitterness."

It was the "huge recess or circular dam" formed by the Taurus mountain range that furnished a comparatively secure abiding place for this ancient form of Christianity, when the Græco-Roman form of Christianity, supported by the imperial authority, was gradually making its influence felt throughout the more exposed parts of Armenia. But the peculiarities of Armenian life and thought were never obliterated, and from the fifth century onward the Græco-Roman influence was largely counteracted by the Persian and later by the Saracen (Mohammedan). Under these influences, which also had much to do with the uprising against image worship in the Byzantine Empire, there was a widespread revival of the old faith in Armenia in the eighth century. It is to this aggressive and uncompromising hostility to the Christianity of the empire, that the term "Paulician" is commonly applied.

Leo the Isaurian (717–741), the iconoclastic emperor, was virtually a Paulician, and it has been maintained that his successor, Constantine Copronymus (741–775), was "a pure Paulician."[1] As the imperial influence, with its Græco-Roman type of Christianity, declined in Armenia, the dominant form of Christianity (Gregorian) in this region became, it would seem, more shamelessly corrupt than before. Bishops were at the heads of clans and ecclesiastical offices came to be hereditary. Infant baptism had been introduced, contrary to the spirit of the old Adoptionist Christology, as a concomitant of this political form of Christianity. Blood-offerings had been instituted, in accord with the old pagan practice, to expiate for the sins of the dead. Crosses had been set up as objects of superstitious reverence.

(2) *Paulician Doctrines and Practices.* From the "Key of Truth," compared with other sources of information,

---

[1] Conybeare, on the authority of Theophanes. See "Key of Truth," Introd., p. cxvi.

the position of the Paulicians at about the close of this period, and presumably from the early time, may be summarized as follows: *a*. They did not call themselves "Paulicians" or "Thondrakians" (a name commonly applied to them because the movement had, during the mediæval time, Thondrak for its center), but rather "the holy, universal, and apostolic church." The Roman, Greek, and Armenian churches are regarded as absolutely evil and Satanic, and are on every occasion denounced in the bitterest way. This was no doubt due to the terrible persecutions suffered by the Paulicians at the hands of the dominant bodies. The ascription of acts of these bodies to Satanic agency by the Paulicians may have given color to the charge of Manichæan dualism so constantly preferred against them by their adversaries. Satan occupies a very prominent place in the "Key of Truth," as he does in Luther's writings.

b. The Adoptionist Christology, that forms so prominent a feature of the Paulician system, has been fully set forth in an earlier section. This did not involve any lack of reverence for Christ or any depreciation of his absoluteness as Saviour and Lord.

c. The Paulicians were uncompromisingly opposed to infant baptism. The arguments of those who "baptize the unbelieving, the reasonless, and the unrepentant" are declared to be "deceitful," and those that thus pervert Christ's ordinance are declared to be "utterly false and full of the deceit of demons,"[1] are said to "lie under the ban of the Lord and of the holy apostles," and to be prompted in this "by the spirit of the adversary of the Father."[2]

> Therefore, according to the word of the Lord, we must first bring them unto the faith, and then give it (baptism) unto them.[3] As the holy, universal, and apostolic catholic church having learned from our Lord Jesus Christ did proceed; so also must ye after them do. For they first taught; secondly, asked for faith; thirdly, induced to repent; and after that, granted holy baptism to those who were of full age, and in particular were cognizant of their original sin. Again ye, the elect ones, must observe the utmost care that they receive before baptism instruction and training, both of body and soul, as St. Paul saith: "Practise thyself in godliness." So must ye without delay bring those who come unto faith, hope, love, and

---

[1] "Key of Truth," Chap. 1. [2] *Ibid.*, Chap. 2. [3] *Ibid.*, Chap. 3.

> repentance, and with extreme care and testing practise them, no matter who they be, lest peradventure any one should be an impostor, or deceitful, or a wizard like Simon. . . Whether men or women, you must not at once baptize them nor communicate them until they have been completely tested.[1]

In one passage it seems to be implied that as Jesus was not baptized until he was thirty years old, so believers should postpone baptism until this age is reached; but it is probable that only maturity and full testing were insisted upon.

A somewhat elaborate baptismal ritual is given, but the manuscript is incomplete and some portions are obscure. The candidate is required to "come on his knees into the midst of the water," and "with great love and tears" to make a solemn profession of his faith. Trine affusion follows. It is the opinion of Conybeare that this affusion was followed by trine immersion, as was the practice of the orthodox Armenian Church, and as we should expect from the fact that the candidate is required to go naked on his knees into the midst of the water. But immersion is not explicitly required in the document as it has been preserved.

d. The Supper is called "the mystery of salvation." The "blessed" bread and wine are said to be "changed into his (Christ's) body and blood." "False popes" "with bread cajole all men and make that their own flesh and blood, and not Christ's. . . Whosoever shall make any water, any mere bread, or any moistened morsel, and distribute deceitfully to the simple people, it is their own flesh and blood and not Christ's." These statements might seem to imply a doctrine of real presence; but it is to be noticed that wicked priests are represented as changing the elements into their own flesh and blood. It is probable that the writer meant to teach only the spiritual partaking of the body and blood of Christ by the believer. Undoubtedly this ordinance, like baptism, was celebrated with the utmost solemnity. It is probable that the Paulicians attached undue importance to both these ordinances.

e. Ministers of the gospel were selected with the utmost care. The positive and negative qualifications are like those prescribed in the New Testament, but more detailed and explicit. Much importance was attached to the solemn setting apart of the "elect ones" with the laying-on of hands. "It is necessary for that man to be on all sides free from blemish, before we give him authority of priesthood, of episcopate, of doctorate, of apostleship, of presidency, and of election. For all these are one and the same thing; nor are they one greater or lesser than another. But they are on an entire level." The graded ministry of the Latins, Greeks, and Armenians is explicitly condemned. "Authority is one, and is not greater or less. For one was the Holy Spirit which came down upon the universal apostles and made them the universal and apostolic catholic holy church."[1]

---

[1] "Key of Truth," Chap. 18.

It seems that their church order was connectional and that a general superintendent presided over the entire body. Language is used in some instances which would seem to imply undue reverence for the "elect ones."

f. Consecrated places and objects and idolatrous practices of every kind were rejected with the utmost decision. A beautiful form of consecration to be administered in the home by the "elect one" seven days after the birth of the child is given in the "Key."

(3) *Sketch of the Movement.* Most of the history of the Paulicians as a distinct and organized form of Christianity falls in the succeeding period; but it seems best to give a brief outline here. The Paulicians suffered severe persecution at the hands of the Emperors Constantine Pogonatus and Justinian II. (684 and 690), many of them dying at the stake. The then leader of the movement, Gegnæsius (715–745), was brought to Constantinople for trial before the patriarch by order of Leo the Isaurian. The Byzantine accounts represent him as having cleared himself by dissimulation; but it is probable that Leo, as an iconoclast, was predisposed in his favor. During the reign of Leo the Isaurian (714–741) and Constantine Copronymus (741–775) the Paulician body had a remarkable growth and spread over Armenia and into many other parts of Asia Minor. Under Con-

---

[1] "Key of Truth," Chap. 22.

stantine VI. and Irene (*c.* 780) they suffered terrible persecution. From this time they allied themselves more or less closely with the Saracens and, aroused to almost fanatical zeal by the persecutions suffered, devastated the portions of the Eastern empire within their reach. Sergius was their great leader (801–835) and was almost worshiped by his people. Under the Empress Theodora, a hundred thousand of the Paulicians are said to have been massacred (*c.* 844). Tephrike, their stronghold, was captured in 873 and their power was broken. The destruction of this great Protestant organization in the East was the death-knell of Oriental Christianity. The Paulicians formed a mighty barrier against Mohammedanism so long as they were tolerated. But because of the persecutions directed against them they were forced at last, as a means of self-preservation, to coöperate with the enemies of Christianity in overthrowing the Christian empire. Their struggle was a heroic one, and they have well been called "Christian Maccabæans."

Constantine Copronymus had encouraged a large body of Paulicians to settle in Thrace. The colony flourished and their principles were disseminated in eastern Europe. During the ninth century the Paulicians of the Taurus, according to Peter Siculus, who spent some months at Tephrike, sent forth zealous missionaries to evangelize Bulgaria. About 970 the Emperor Tzimiskes, himself an Armenian, sent a hundred thousand Paulicians to the lower Danubian region. That this great body of evangelical Christians should have leavened eastern Europe with their teachings might have been expected. The historical connection between the Paulicians and the widespread and highly influential evangelical movement in central and western Europe from the eleventh century onward cannot at present be accurately traced, but is no less certain.

Though greatly depressed in the Taurus region by continuous persecution, the Paulicians have survived to the present century in the neighborhood of Thondrak, and it was among a party of refugees, who, after the Russo-Turkish War (1828–1829), had settled in a portion of Armenia acquired by Russia, that the "Key of Truth" was discovered and, by an inquisitorial process, much interesting information was brought to light.[1]

5. *The Iconoclastic Controversy.*

LITERATURE: Documents in Hardouin, "*Conc.*," Vol. IV., and Mansi, "*Conc.*," Vol. XII.–XIV.; Goldast, "*Imperialia Decreta de cultu Imaginum in utroque Imperio*"; John of Damascus, "*De Imaginibus*," etc.; Nicephorus, "*Breviarium Historiæ*"; Theophanes Confessor, "*Chronographia*"; Hefele, "*Conciliengesch.*," *Bd.* III., *Seit.* 366, *seq.*; Gieseler, *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 14, *seq.*; Neander, Vol. III., p. 198, *seq.*; Alzog, Vol. II., p. 206, *seq.*; Milman, "Latin Christianity," Vol. II.; Greenwood, "*Cathedra Petri*," Vol. II., p. 463, *seq.*; p. 532, *seq.*; Hergenröther, "*Kirchengeschichte*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 528, *seq.* (Roman Catholic, but remarkably satisfactory); Herzog, "*Kirchengeschichte*," *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 10, *seq.*; Schwarzlose, "*Der Bilderstreit, ein Kampf d. Gr. Kirche um ihre Eigenart u. ihre Freiheit*"; Herzog-Hauck, 3d. ed., art. "*Bilderstreitigkeiten und Bilderverehrung*"; Smith and Cheetham, "Dic. of Chr. Antiq.," art. "Images."

(*1*) *Preliminary.*

a. Introduction of Image Worship into the Christian Churches. During the first, second, and third centuries, Christians rejected with abhorrence anything like a veneration of images. They were reproached by the pagans as atheists, from the fact that they carefully abstained from anything savoring of idolatry.

When the pagans replied to the charge of image worship preferred by Christians against them, that they worshiped, not the images, but the gods that the images represent, Christians asked them why then they did not turn their eyes toward heaven.[2] The Synod of Elvira (305) decreed that "pictures ought not to be in the churches," the reason assigned being the danger lest the painting or image be worshiped or adored. This decree is evidence of the fact that pictures were already beginning to be venerated. From the time of Constantine onward this practice developed rapidly.

b. Causes of the Prevalence of Image Worship. (*a*) To a very great extent it was transferred immediately from paganism. Men of influence came from paganism to Christianity with little change of views. Such men were in many cases appointed to high offices in the churches, and they devoted their energies to the assimilation of Christian churches to heathen temples. (*b*) It was not at first intended that the pictures should be actually worshiped. The aim was rather to instruct the uneducated in Christian truth. (*c*) The monastic system, with its perversion of the imagination, was very favorable to an entire perversion of the use of images to actual idolatry.

---

[1] See Conybeare's edition of the "Key of Truth," Introd., p. 23, *seq.*

[2] Lactantius, "*Inst. Div.*," Bk. II., Chap. 2.

c. Images in the East and in the West. Oriental and Occidental Christians, as they differed widely in other respects, so also in the use of images. As monasticism had its most perverse and extreme development in the East, so the use of images was sure to lead to the worst results there. It seems that the Oriental mind is so constituted as to be incapable of using images at all in connection with religion, without making them actual objects of worship. The worship of images had, by the seventh century, become so marked that Christians were reproached by Jews and Mohammedans as idolaters.

(2) *Rise of the Controversy.*

The Saracens had by the eighth century established themselves firmly in Palestine, Syria, Armenia, etc., and were still aggressive. In 723 the Caliph Jezid had commanded the removal of all pictures from Christian churches within his realm. The agitation of the subject in the Saracen regions extended into Asia Minor. From the beginning of the eighth century several bishops—Constantine of Nicolia, in Phrygia, Theodosius of Ephesus, Thomas of Claudiopolis, etc.—had opposed image worship. These men had great influence with the Emperor Leo the Isaurian (718–741), who may also have imbibed his aversion to image worship from his dealings with the Saracens. Leo looked upon image worship not only as an abomination in itself, but also as a chief obstacle to the conversion of the Jews and the Saracens. He had repelled a great Saracen invasion, and he now desired to lay the foundation of a permanent peace with this aggressive power. He thought that the extirpation of image worship would not only increase the unity of his empire and promote peaceable relations with the Saracens, but would also greatly promote the enlightenment of his people. A volcanic eruption (726) led him to take still more decisive ground against image worship. He now issued an edict prohibiting prostration before images, and directing that images be put so high that the people could not kiss them. The execution of this decree met with much opposition, and was the occasion of many bloody riots. The monks, especially, who were much given to idolatry and who were engaged to a great extent in the painting of religious pictures, were chiefly instrumental in fomenting insurrection. The patriarch of Constantinople, Germanus, opposed the iconoclastic measures and was deposed from his office (730).

(3) *Statement of Opposing Views.*

a. Views of Pope Gregory II. and other Advocates of the Veneration of Images. The arguments in favor of images are: (*a*) That God commanded cherubim and seraphim to be made. (*b*) That pictures of Christ, alive and dead, and pictures of the apostles and martyrs, were taken by spectators to be looked upon by those that should come after. (*c*) That Christ himself sent his own picture to King Abgarus, at Edessa. (*d*) The commandment not to make graven images, etc., was necessary at the time to preserve the Israelites from heathenish idolatry; but circumstances are different now. God was invisible then and could not be represented. In Christ he became visible and capable of representation. (*e*) Those that venerate images are not to be called idolaters. Rather the memory is thereby aroused; the inexperienced and ignorant mind is erected and borne on high through those whose names, whose appellations, whose images these are.

It was attempted to make a distinction between *προσκύνησις* (adoration or prostration before images) and *λατρεία* (worship in the highest sense). The latter must be rendered to God alone; the former may be rendered to pictures of Christ and the saints.

b. Views of the Iconoclasts. The grounds which the Iconoclasts urged in favor of their position are: (*a*) That image worship is prohibited by the Old and the New Testaments (Deut. 5 : 4, 8; John 4 : 24; Rom. 1 : 23–25) and by the Fathers of the early church. (*b*) That it consists in the application of a heathenish art to purposes of religion, which is an abomination, and which is dishonoring to Christ and the saints whom it is sought thus to represent. (*c*) That Christ having established the Supper indicated thereby, that under the form of bread and wine alone he desired to be represented. (*d*) The veneration of images involves either Eutychianism or Nestorianism; that is to say, such a union of the humanity and deity in Christ that only the deity is perceptible (in this case the image would represent the divine), or such a distinction of the natures that the humanity can be represented separately. The hypostatical union of the divine and the human in Christ is inconceivable, and hence cannot be represented pictorially.

(4) *Progress of the Controversy.*

a. Pope Gregory II. Opposes Leo. Pope Gregory II. wrote a denunciatory letter to Leo (*c.* 730) reproaching him for placing stumbling-blocks before the weak ones of Christ, urging him to trust to the judgment of the councils and the Fathers in the matter of images rather than to his own ignorance, and setting forth the grounds mentioned above in favor of the veneration of images.

b. Leo's Reply to Pope Gregory II. Leo was not a man to be turned aside from his purpose by the denunciations of a pope. The purport of his reply is: (*a*) That the six general councils had said nothing about images. (*b*) He declared that he himself was at the same time emperor and bishop, *i. e.*, was supreme in civil and ecclesiastical matters. (*c*) He threatened to destroy the image of St. Peter at Rome and to imprison the pope.

c. Roman Synod against Iconoclasm under Gregory III. In 731 at a synod of ninety-three bishops, called by Gregory III., a decree of excommunication was passed against whomsoever should thenceforth remove, destroy, or injure images of Mary, Christ, or the saints.

d. Leo's Retaliation. Leo retaliated by cutting off the papal revenues in Sicily and Calabria, and by annexing the churches of Illyria to the patriarchate of Constantinople.

e. Constantine V. and Iconoclasm. Constantine was not less averse to image worship than his father had been.

From 743 to 775 he carried on an exterminating war against image worship. All public officials, and all ecclesiastics and monks were required to abjure image worship, and those that refused were ruthlessly slaughtered. He seemed bent upon the utter extermination of the monks. In 754 he called a council, in which image worship was stigmatized as Satan's poison in the church, and it was declared that God had raised up the emperor for its extirpation. The grounds against image worship mentioned above were set forth on this occasion. The religious pictures were now almost all destroyed—some burned, some concealed by whitewashing the walls, and in their places were put, in some instances, landscape and hunting scenes. Few fiercer persecutions are recorded in history than those of Constantine Copronymus.

f. Leo IV. and Iconoclasm. His successor, Leo IV., was also an Iconoclast, but was weak of purpose. His wife, Irene, was a favorer of image worship. Leo IV. died 780, and was succeeded by Constantine VI., a boy nine years of age.

g. Irene and the Second Council of Nicæa (787). Irene was now practically empress, and she at once set about devising plans for the restoration of image worship. The army, which had received its training from Constantine Copronymus, was known to be decidedly averse to images. The ecclesiastics throughout the empire had taken oaths against images, as a condition of their installation. Irene began by appointing monks to the most important ecclesiastical offices. She opened the way for all ranks of her subjects to become monks. The patriarch of Constantinople, Paulus, who had been a zealous Iconoclast, was induced to lay down the patriarchal dignity and to recommend for the position Tarasius, first Secretary of State, who was known to be entirely subservient to the will of Irene. In accordance with a preconcerted plan, Tarasius declined to accept the proffered dignity, except on condition that measures be taken for restoring the Eastern Church to fellowship with the rest of Christendom. He insisted on calling an œcumenical council for the purpose of reuniting the church. To this end he entered into a correspondence with Pope Hadrian I., setting forth his own orthodoxy, and requesting Hadrian to send delegates to a council to meet at Constantinople. Hadrian was satisfied with Tarasius' orthodoxy, and agreed in this case to overlook the irregularity of his elevation to the patriarchal dignity. It was designed to make this council œcumenical, *i. e.*, to have represented in it all the patriarchates of the East and the West. Alexandria and Antioch were under the dominion of the Saracens, and it was impracticable for them to send representatives. But to secure the semblance where the reality was wanting some monks were introduced to represent these patriarchates. The council was convened at Constantinople in 786, but the imperial troops, abetted probably by a large faction of the bishops, besieged the church where it was to be held, and by their threats dispersed the gathered prelates. Irene yielded for the time, but took measures for securing a guard on which she could rely, and in 787 convened a council at Nicæa. By this time the bishops, who were for the most part men of no moral or intellectual force, had all made up their minds to yield to the will of Irene. They came to the council ready to confess their sins, and professing to have become convinced by the declarations of Scripture and the Fathers that the use of images was in accordance with apostolic tradition.

The council laid down the distinction mentioned above, between *bowing down before* or *kissing*, and *worshiping*. The former may be bestowed upon images; the latter, upon God alone. Image worship was thus once more established in the East.

h. Opposition to the Second Nicene Council by Charlemagne. Charlemagne, aided by his theologians, published the "Four Caroline Books" against the Second Nicene Council. In this he condemns alike the Iconoclasts and the image worshipers. Images are useful for the ornamentation of the churches, and for the perpetuation of holy deeds. The idea that images are *necessary* for perpetuating the memory of holy things is scouted. The image worshipers, it is maintained, acknowledge themselves incapable of looking beyond the sensible into the spiritual. Christians having fellowship with Christ, ought to have him always present in their hearts. The Scriptures, and not images, are the proper outward means for gaining acquaintance with Christ. This writing of Charlemagne is a remarkably clear and evangelical discussion of the whole question.

At a Frankish Council at Frankfort-on-the-Main, called by Charlemagne in 794, the "adoration and service of images" was condemned. It is probable that the worship of images had never gone to the same extreme in the Frankish Church as in the East. The general enlightenment, moreover, that was introduced and fostered by Charlemagne, could not fail to bring out truer views with regard to images.

i. Iconoclastic Reaction in the East. The Iconoclasts had been suppressed, but not exterminated. In the army especially, the iconoclastic spirit prevailed, and a large proportion of the subjects of the Eastern emperor were ready, on the slightest encouragement, to renew the struggle against images. In 813, Leo the Armenian, a soldier and an Iconoclast, became emperor. He intended to proceed cautiously, but the iconoclastic spirit of the army could not be restrained, and in 814 he issued an edict against image worship. In 815 the decrees of the Second Nicene Council were declared null and void by a synod held in Constantinople. Persecution followed, but by no means so fierce as that under Leo the Isaurian and Constantine Copronymus.

k. Final Victory of the Image Worshipers in the East. After image worship had been opposed with varying energy by several emperors the decrees of the Second Nicene Council were re-enacted under the regency of Theodora (842–867), images were restored to the churches, and the Iconoclasts were persecuted with great severity.

The Eastern Church has restricted its images to pictures and mosaics, conformed rigorously to traditional and conventional models. The Roman Catholic Church has given the freest scope to religious art, encouraging sculpture as well as painting, and allowing each artist to depict Christ and the saints according to his own ideals. The image worship of the East is probably more degrading than that of the West.

CHAPTER III.

THE RISE AND GROWTH OF THE PAPAL POWER

LITERATURE: Works of leading popes in Migne's "*Patrologia Latina*"; collections of Canons of Councils by Mansi, Hardouin, and Hefele; Jaffé, "*Regesta Pont. Rom.*"; Greenwood, "*Cathedra Petri*"; Milman, "Lat. Christianity"; Pennington, "Epochs of the Papacy"; Lea, "Studies in Ch. Hist."; Bryce, "The Holy Roman Empire"; Gibbon, "Dec. and Fall"; Langen, "*Gesch. d. Röm. Kirche*"; Guizot, "Hist. of Civilization"; "The Fathers for Eng. Readers" ("Leo the Great" and "Gregory the Great"); Alzog, "Univ. Ch. Hist." (R. Cath.), Sec. 87, 125–131, 161–166; Guizot, "Hist. of France," Vol. I.; Bright, "The Roman See in the Early Church," 1896; works on ch. hist. and encyclopedia articles on the various popes and emperors involved. For an admirable summary of the history of the relations between Church and State from Constantine to Charlemagne, see Greenwood, Vol. II., pp. 5–52.

I. PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS.

1. *Claims of Rome as to Early Pre-eminence.*

WE have seen that from the beginning of the second century the position of the Roman church was a highly honorable one, and that it was often appealed to by contending factions in other churches. But of such appeals it may be said, first, that Rome had no monopoly of them, as every church of influence and repute was frequently asked for advice and moral support; and secondly, that the rescripts carried no authority with them beyond what naturally grew out of the good repute of the church. This remark would apply fully to the transactions of provincial churches with Rome in the time of Cyprian. Cyprian could speak in the most extravagant way of the authority of Rome when it suited his purpose to do so; but when Rome failed to sustain him, no man could rebuke the bishop of Rome more severely. As one of the great metropolitan churches that could boast of apostolic foundation, Rome occupied an influential position side by side with Alexandria, Antioch, etc.

During the first three centuries the Roman church did little in the way of theological advancement. Hippolytus and Novatian are the only important writers produced, and of these the former was completely out of harmony with the church and denounced its bishops in the most unsparing manner, while the latter felt himself obliged to lead a schism and become head of a sect. But what Rome lacked in literary and theological ability was more than counterbalanced by its practical wisdom and its organizing ability. In some respects the absence of the speculative and systematizing spirit was advantageous to Rome in the struggle for ascendency, for it served to prevent such doctrinal strife as kept the Oriental churches in perpetual turmoil, enabled it to maintain a high reputation for orthodoxy, and so favored its influential interference during the great doctrinal controversies of the East. Besides, the church was thereby left free to devote itself to practical questions, and was enabled to be on the alert for opportunities of aggrandizement.

The interference of the Arian Emperor Constantius with the government of the Roman church, the expulsion of Bishop Liberius, and the effort to secure the recognition of Felix, proved unsuccessful, as the Roman people adhered to Liberius. A most unseemly struggle, accompanied by bloodshed, occurred (366) between Damasus and Ursinus, rival claimants of the Roman bishopric. Damasus triumphed. Siricius (384–399) set forth claims of universal jurisdiction somewhat like those of later popes. From this time onward Rome pursued an aggressive career.

2. *The Relative Position Accorded to Rome by the Nicene Council.*

The sixth canon of the Nicene Council gives to the bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome a certain authority over the bishops of the great divisions of the empire of which these cities were centers, but there is no hint of according a primacy to Rome. In fact, both the other patriarchates are mentioned quite as prominently as Rome. The canon reads, according to the Greek text:

> Let the ancient usages which exist in Egypt, and Libya, and Pentapolis, remain in force, to the effect that the bishop of Alexandria should have authority over all these, since this [the exercise of authority over the provincial churches of the West] is customary also for the bishop who is in Rome; and similarly, both as to Antioch and in the other provinces, let the churches have their privileges secured to them.

A clause was interpolated into this canon in the interest of the Roman primacy as follows: "Rome has always held the primacy." This interpolation was first used, so far as we know, by the representatives of Leo the Great at the council of Chalcedon (451).

3. *Relation of Constantinople to Rome in the Struggle for Supremacy.*

Constantinople was virtually a new city founded by the Emperor Constantine as the imperial capital. The church of Byzantium had no claim to apostolic foundation, but was subject to the bishop of Heraclea in Thrace. The Eastern emperors naturally sought to give to their capital a primacy in ecclesiastical matters, and inasmuch as apostolic foundation was thought to be essential to ecclesiastical dignity, the Heraclean foundation, by a sort of legal fiction, was transferred to Constantinople. Constantinople was dependent on Antioch and Alexandria for an educated clergy, and we have seen how great was the rivalry between these two centers in regard to the theological control of the capital. The immediate surveillance of the imperial government left little opportunity to the patriarchs of Constantinople to develop independent power. Their attitude toward Rome at any time was determined wholly by imperial policy. When the Eastern empire was flourishing there was a disposition to exalt the patriarchate of Constantinople. When an important political end could be subserved by asserting the superior dignity of the Roman See, the emperors did not as a rule hesitate to recognize the pretensions of Rome.

4. *The Relations of Imperial to Patriarchal and Papal Authority.*

The Eastern emperors from Constantine onward regarded themselves as supreme rulers of the Church as well as of the State. In fact they regarded the hierarchy simply as a part of the political machinery, and they bestowed care and money and dignity on the church simply as a means to the promotion of civil order and unity Constantine regarded himself as a bishop of bishops He called the Nicene Council and presided over it, occupied himself with the suppression of heresy, and legislated freely for the church. His successors followed in his footsteps in this particular. The legislation of the empire from Constantine to Justinian as embodied in the "*Corpus Juris Civilis*," compiled under the direction of the latter, makes the foregoing statement abundantly evident. There was during this age no thought in the imperial mind of a Church independent of or superior to the State.

no

5. *Circumstances that Favored the Growth of the Papal Power.*

(1) The supposed Petrine foundation and the supposed primacy accorded by Christ to Peter.

(2) Rome early enjoyed a recognized supremacy in the West and was free from local rivalry. In the East Constantinople had Alexandria and Antioch to contend against, and these were often willing to recognize the supremacy of Rome afar off, in view of the moral support that Rome could render, rather than that of Constantinople which was nearer at hand and often oppressive.

(3) The transference of the imperial capital from Rome to Constantinople and the feebleness of the Western emperors after the division of the empire gave free scope to the bishops of Rome. They soon came to be looked upon as the most important personages in the West, and Eastern emperors who wished to gain advantages in the West were glad to avail themselves of papal influence. This they could do only by recognizing the high claims of the popes.

(4) The barbarian invasions, with the setting up of a number of rival governments in Southern Europe, gave to the popes many opportunities to form advantageous alliances, and so great was the political sagacity of the Roman See that these opportunities were usually made the most of.

(5) The growth of Christianity from the fifth century onward was almost entirely in the West. In the East Christendom was rent asunder by doctrinal controversies, and the Persian and Mohammedan powers soon began to encroach upon Christian territory. In the West the barbarian tribes, many of whom had been evangelized by the Arians, were speedily brought to a nominal orthodoxy, their rulers being glad to enjoy the moral support of Rome in their efforts to extend and confirm their dominions. Rome had the advantage, therefore, of occupying the center of influence in the part of the world where Christianity was to make its greatest conquests.

(6) The great doctrinal conflicts in the East and the mutual jealousies of patriarchs and metropolitans caused frequent appeals to be made to Rome, and gave to Rome many opportunities for advantageous interference.

(7) The almost unsullied orthodoxy of the Roman Church during the Arian and succeeding controversies greatly added to the prestige of Rome.

II. LEO THE GREAT AND THE PAPACY (440–461).

LITERATURE: Greenwood, Vol. I., p. 343, *seq.;* Milman, Vol. I., p. 253, *seq.;* Tillemont, "Mem.," XV., p. 414, *seq.;* Gore, "Leo the Great," also art. in "Dict. of Chr. Biog."; Müller, "*Kirchengesch.*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 263, *seq.;* Langen, "*Gesch. d. R. Kirche v. Leo I. bis Nikolaus I.*," *Seit.* 1–140; Lea, *passim;* Schaff, Vol. III., p. 314, *seq.;* Gieseler, Vol. I., p. 394, *seq.;* Mœller, p. 345, *seq.;* Alzog, Sec. 130.

Leo was elected by the clergy, senate, and people of Rome during his absence. A Roman in sentiment as in birth, possessed of the learning of his age, a statesman of the shrewdest type, he embodied all the pride and aggressiveness of imperial and ecclesiastical Rome. The times were highly favorable for the realization of his ambitious aims, and he lost no opportunity that presented itself for securing advantages for the Roman See. Among his achievements the following may be mentioned:

1. He condemned the Manichæans of Rome and secured their banishment by the Emperor Valentinian III.

2. In Proconsular Africa he availed himself of the disorder caused by the Vandal conquest (Donatists,

Catholics, and Arians being in conflict) to secure recognition of his authority by the Catholic party.

3. In Gaul he humiliated Archbishop Hilary of Arles and secured the recognition of his authority. Hilary, an able and pious prelate, had, with the advice of a Synod, deposed a bishop named Celedonius, because he had married a widow and before his ordination had presided as judge at a criminal proceeding that had resulted in capital punishment, either of which acts, according to the recognized ecclesiastical law of the time, disqualified him for the episcopal office. The right of Hilary to deal with Celedonius grew out of the fact that he was metropolitan of the region in which the diocese of Celedonius was situated. Leo's predecessor had twenty-eight years before expressly recognized this relation. Celedonius appealed to Rome and persuaded Leo that Hilary had exceeded his jurisdiction. Leo ignored the previous decision, set aside Hilary's act in deposing Celedonius, received Celedonius into communion, and restored him to his bishopric. Hilary journeyed on foot to Rome and remonstrated with Leo. He was thrown into prison for his arrogance, cut off from the communion of Rome, and restored only after he had thoroughly humiliated himself.

4. In connection with the foregoing transaction, the Emperor Valentinian III., who was greatly under Leo's influence, confirmed Leo's sentence in the matter of Hilary and Celedonius, commanded the governor of Gaul to aid in carrying out Leo's decision, and decreed "that not only no Gallic bishop, but no bishop of any other province, be permitted in contradiction to ancient custom to do anything without the authority of the venerable pope of the Eternal City; but on the contrary to them and to all men, let whatsover the authority of the Apostolic See has ordained, does ordain, or shall ordain, be as law, so that any bishop being summoned to the judgment seat of the Roman pontiff be thereunto compelled by the governor of the province." This joint action of pope and emperor constituted an alliance offensive and defensive between the spiritual and temporal sovereigns. The State spiritual is thenceforth to be represented as fully and as universally by the bishop of Rome as the State temporal is represented by the emperor.

5. He asserted his authority in Illyricum by taking sides with the metropolitan of Thessalonica, who was in revolt against the patriarch of Constantinople.

6. In connection with the Eutychian Controversy in the East, Leo gained several substantial advantages. The appeals to Leo by both parties; his doctrinal letter; the rejection of this letter by the "Robber Synod"; its acceptance by the Council of Chalcedon; his controlling influence in this council through his legates, who insisted on the fullest recognition of his authority, are familiar facts. Anatolius, who had succeeded Flavian in the patriarchate of Constantinople and was Eutychian at heart, was compelled by the emperor to subscribe Leo's letter. Leo followed up the advantage he had thus gained over his rival by sending him minute directions as to the administration of the affairs of his diocese. Anatolius was thus brought into a position of recognized dependence on the pope. The Council of Chalcedon (451), composed of six hundred and thirty bishops, was on the whole highly favorable to the papal pretensions. The legates of Leo presided in regard to ecclesiastical matters and their demands were for the most part accorded. Leo's doctrinal letter was accepted as a doctrinal standard, and those who had impugned Leo's authority in the "Robber Synod" were severely dealt with. Yet the twenty-eighth canon aroused the indignation of Leo by bestowing on the bishop of New Rome (Constantinople), as the center of imperial government, equal authority with that of Old Rome, and giving him the right to ordain the metropolitans of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. Leo protested most vigorously against the supposed infringement of his prerogative. When Anatolius attempted to exercise the authority bestowed, Leo promptly excommunicated him and threatened to array against him the dioceses of the East. Anatolius was compelled by the emperor to yield. The emperor himself declared that the assent of the bishop of Rome was essential to the validity of the acts of councils, and Leo thus gained a substantial victory. It should be said that the canon in question only asserted a secondary rank, after Rome, for Constantinople. The protest against this canon has continued to the present.

7. Leo's statesmanship in dealing with the barbarian invaders added much to his prestige. On two occasions he saved Rome from being sacked, first by Attila, the Hun, and secondly by Genseric, the Vandal.

III. THE PONTIFICATE OF GELASIUS (492–496).

LITERATURE: Greenwood, Vol. II., p. 42, *seq.;* Milman, Vol. I., p. 347, *seq.;* Lea, *passim;* Mœller, p. 349.

Gelasius, an African by birth, united African zeal with Roman astuteness. He had all the pride of power and position that characterized Leo. He was prepared to utilize all the advantages that Leo had gained and to go forward to new conquests. With him begins a new phase of the controversy between Rome and Constantinople.

1. He refused to receive into communion Euphemius, patriarch of Constantinople. Eutychians were still strong in the East, and adherents to the Chalcedonian symbol looked to Rome as the bulwark of orthodoxy. Gelasius took advantage of the fact that a number of names of heretical bishops had been retained on the calendar of the Eastern Church and refused to recognize the patriarch of Constantinople until such names should be erased. The patriarch and the Emperor Anastasius strove in vain to conciliate him. When it was complained that the excommunication of the bishops in question was outside of the prerogative of the bishop of Rome according to the decision of the Nicene Council, he replied that they knew not what they were talking about, as they were the first to violate the canons in refusing obedience to the *primate of all the churches*. From the decrees of Rome, he urged, there is no appeal. He seems to have based his claim on the sixth Nicene canon (interpolated), on Leo's achievements, and on the edict of Valentinian III.

2. Gelasius seems to have gone beyond Leo in his view of the relation of the civil to the ecclesiastical power. The Emperor Anastasius had complained that Gelasius was withdrawing from him the allegiance of his subjects by his persistent refusal of fellowship to the See of Constantinople. Gelasius in reply professed absolute

submission to the emperor in all matters of lawful obedience. But the world is governed by two powers, the pontifical and the royal. The former is the more grave and important of the two, for it must render account unto God for the deeds of kings themselves. Though the king rules over men in the world, he is yet in duty bound in spiritual things to submit to his prelates. In relation to the administration of divine ordinances, he is not a ruler but a subject. The defiant attitude of Gelasius shows that the papacy was conscious of power equal to the imperial in any conflict that might arise.

IV. THE PONTIFICATE OF SYMMACHUS (498–514).

LITERATURE: Greenwood, Vol. II., p. 68, *seq.*; Schaff, Vol. III., p. 324, *seq.*; Milman, Vol. I., p. 350; Gieseler, Vol. I., p. 496; Mœller, p. 350; "Dict. of Chr. Biog.," Herzog-Hauck, and Wetzer u. Welte, art. "Symmachus."

A striking proof of the futility of Gelasius' claim to independence of the civil rulers is to be seen in the fact that in 498, when two rival claimants of the papal chair appeared, Theodoric the Ostrogoth, an Arian, interfered, secured the election of Symmachus as pope and the appointment of his rival to a bishopric, called a council and caused it to adopt a canon restraining criminal ambition in seeking the papal office, and appointed a visitor with power to reform the disorders that prevailed in the Roman church. Symmachus was suspended until the charges against him could be investigated. He promised to submit to the decision of the council, but finding that the bishops were unwilling to see the papacy thus degraded, and being popular in Rome, he determined to resist investigation and to stand upon prerogative.

1. The theory advanced in Symmachus' interest, in his conflict with Theodoric, was that of papal irresponsibility. No tribunal, it was claimed, can compel the appearance of a pope or pronounce sentence against him in his absence.

2. One of the Roman deacons maintained that by virtue of his office the pope is impeccable, and in 503 Symmachus convoked a council that made this opinion a dogma of the church.

3. The controversies in the East continued to rage, and Symmachus was implored in view of the extreme difficulty of fulfilling the demands made by Rome to excuse the toleration of a certain amount of heresy. Symmachus would not listen to any compromise, and insisted on the anathematizing of all Eutychian leaders as a condition of fellowship.

V. HORMISDAS (514–523).

LITERATURE: Greenwood, Vol. I., pp. 84–119; Milman, Vol. I., p. 423; Lea, pp. 285, 287; encyclopedias, "Hormisdas."

He was a man of the same stamp as Leo and Gelasius, and succeeded in accomplishing what his predecessors had labored for in vain.

1. In 513 the Emperor Anastasius proposed a general council for the pacification of the church. Eutychianism was gaining the ascendency, and civil affairs were in the utmost confusion. Hormisdas required as a condition of the papal sanction an immediate and unqualified adoption of the decrees of Chalcedon, together with Leo's doctrinal letter, and the absolute submission of the emperor and the Oriental bishops to the papal guidance. The demands were not at this time acceded to, but Anastasius was succeeded in 518 by Justin I., and with him orthodoxy again became triumphant in the East.

2. Justin proceeded to make advances to the pope, and finally yielded to the demands made of Anastasius. Constantinople was humiliated by having the names of a number of bishops erased from the calendar. Rome had triumphed at last. The mass of Eastern Christians, however, were glad to see unity and orthodoxy restored at any price.

VI. JUSTINIAN AND THE PAPACY (527–565).

LITERATURE: "*Corpus Juris Civilis*"; Hadley, "Rom. Law"; Morey, "Rom. Law"; Greenwood, Vol. I., pp. 120–172; Milman, Vol. I., pp. 449–514; Lea, *passim*; Tozer, "The Ch. and the E. Emp.," *passim*; Gibbon, Chaps. 40–45; encyc. articles on "Justinian," "Roman Law," etc.

After the death of Theodoric anarchy prevailed in Italy. Corrupt practices in striving after the papal chair were more shameless than ever. Yet even the most worthless popes were careful to maintain and advance papal prerogative.

1. *Justinian and the Independence of the Papal Power.*

From Justinian's letters and legislation it is evident that he had no idea of admitting the irresponsibility of ecclesiastical government. He believed in and exercised the right to legislate for every department of ecclesiastical life. The imperial dignity, in his view, transcended every other. Though Rome was in the power of the Goths, he maintained his right to it, and was able at last to secure the recognition of his authority.

2. *Justinian's Declaration Regarding the Patriarchate of Constantinople.*

During his reign a number of bishops revolted from the rule of the metropolitan of Thessalonica, who was now an adherent of the patriarch of Constantinople, claiming that they were under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome. Justinian supported the claims of the patriarch of Constantinople and gave him the title of *Œcumenical Patriarch*.

3. *Justinian's Declaration with Regard to the Pope.*

In the preamble to a decree, in 532, Justinian declared that he had been diligent both in subjecting and in uniting to the Roman See all the clergy of the entire region of the East, and expressed a firm resolve never to permit any matter affecting the general state of the church to be transacted without notifying the head of all the churches.

4. *Capture of Rome by Belisarius and the Elevation of the Profligate Vigilius to the Papal Chair.*

Belisarius, one of the greatest generals of his age, was sent by Justinian to secure the recognition of the imperial authority in Italy. He seems to have had a corrupt understanding with the Empress Theodora that he would use all his authority for placing Vigilius, a Eutychian, in the papal chair. Vigilius at once sent letters of communion to the Eutychian bishops of the East and abjured the doctrines of Chalcedon. Justinian hearing of these scandalous proceedings compelled Vigilius to reaffirm his adherence to the doctrines of Chalcedon.

Thus Justinian, while maintaining the rights of the patriarch of Constantinople, acknowledged a kind of superiority in the Roman See without defining wherein that superiority consisted. He gave many additional privileges to the clergy in general and particularly to the bishops, entrusting to the latter extensive civil jurisdiction.

VII. THE MEROVINGIAN KINGDOM AND THE CHURCH (496–752).

LITERATURE: Milman, Vol. I., p. 378, *seq.*; Greenwood, Vol. I., p. 485, *seq.*, Vol. II., p. 184, *seq.*, p. 272, *seq.*; Guizot, "Hist. of Civ.," Lec. 12 and 13, "Hist. of France," Vol. I.; Bryce, p. 34, *seq.*; Schaff, Vol. IV., p. 80, *seq.*; Stephen, "Lect. on the Hist. of France"; Bradley, "The Goths"; Merivale, "The Continental Teutons," p. 57, *seq.*; Alzog, Sec. 155; Kitchin, "Hist. of Fr.," Vol. I.

The conversion of the Merovingian chieftain, Clovis, to the Catholic faith is an event of primary importance in the history of the papacy. Starting out with a mere handful of followers, Clovis had by his military prowess attached a number of tribes to himself. Brought up in the Arian faith, he had married a Catholic wife. Observing the power and influence of the papacy, and anxious to avail himself of papal support, he professed conversion in 496, and his entire following united with him in adherence to Catholicism, three thousand of whom were baptized along with himself soon after his conversion. As he expected, the Catholics rallied around him as the only Catholic prince in the West, and assisted him in conquering the Arian princes. The Goths had become luxurious and disinclined to the hardships of war, and were easily overcome by the Frankish warrior. Victory followed victory until Gaul, Burgundy, and Bavaria were more or less firmly united under one government. Thus was established a vigorous Catholic power, which found its interest in promoting the papacy, and which in turn was zealously supported by it.

Clovis and his successors bestowed considerable territorial possessions upon the church, and acquiesced to some extent in the papal claims. But the Franks were little civilized, and the rulers dealt in the most arbitrary way with bishops and clergy. When a Frankish king bestowed territory upon the church for a bishopric it was regarded as given in feudal tenure, the rights of suzerainty being retained. Excommunication and interdicts were employed against them in vain. Obsequiousness was the price of their support.

VIII. THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY THE GREAT (590–604).

LITERATURE: Greenwood, Vol. II., pp. 211–241; Milman, Vol. II., pp. 39–103; Schaff, Vol. IV., p. 211, *seq.;* Barnby, "Greg. the Great" (also in "Dict. of Chr. Biog."); Lea, *passim.*

From the time of Justinian to that of Gregory the papacy gained little advantage. Italy had been deprived of her independence and stripped of her resources by the Eastern Empire and by barbarian invasion. The Lombards invaded Italy in 570, and in 577 the Roman See became independent of the emperor. Gregory became pope in the midst of pestilence and civil turmoil. It is not wonderful that he should have hesitated to assume so dangerous and responsible a position. His tastes were those of a recluse rather than those of a politician, but his learning, his confidence in papal prerogative, his persistence in pursuing a policy of papal aggrandizement, his political shrewdness, and his reputation for sanctity, made him one of the greatest and most successful of popes.

1. Rome had lost much of the ascendency that it had gained over Constantinople. When the Emperor Maurice was assassinated by Phocas and the latter ascended the throne, Gregory congratulated him on the event, and thus sought to gain his allegiance to the papal cause.

2. He established the practice of bestowing the pallium upon bishops, thus attempting to make the pope's consent necessary to the validity of episcopal ordinations.

3. He insisted, with great vehemence, on the celibacy of the clergy. Being himself a monk, and swayed by monkish ideals, he aimed to bring the entire body of the

clergy into an essentially monkish position. Yet when other ends were to be subserved thereby, he was willing to relax the rigor of his requirements, as in the case of British missions.

4. He sent missionaries to Britain and Germany, where a free, evangelical form of Christianity had long existed, with a view to subjugating these Christians to the Roman See.

5. He succeeded in greatly extending the authority of the Roman See by missionary enterprise and by forming advantageous alliances with civil rulers in the West as well as with the emperor in the East.

6. By preparing forms of worship and by insisting on uniformity of worship throughout Catholic Christendom, he did much toward unifying and solidifying the papal domain.

IX. THE CARLOVINGIAN KINGDOM AND THE PAPACY.

LITERATURE: "Works of Charlemagne" in Migne's "*Patr. Lat.*," Vol. XCVII. and XCVIII.; Baluzius, "*Capitularia Regum Francorum*"; Greenwood, Vol. III., pp. 52–127; Milman, Vol. II., pp. 402–551; Schaff, Vol. IV., p. 203, *seq.*; Cutts, "Charlemagne"; Guizot, "Hist. of Civ."; encyc. articles (esp. "Dict. of Chr. Biog." and Herzog-Hauck) on "Charlemagne," "Pepin," "Charles Martel," "Boniface" (Winfrid), "Stephen III.," "Donation of Constantine," etc.

By the middle of the eighth century the church had sunk very low. The civilization of Southern Europe had been swept away and the new civilization had not yet taken its place. Learning was almost extinct, except in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. The barbarian rulers were accustomed to appoint as bishops their relatives and military followers, without reference to their literary, moral, or spiritual qualifications. Bishops so appointed spent their time in revelry, hunting, warfare, the management of their estates, etc. The Merovingian rulers soon degenerated and their power fell into the hands of the mayors of the palace. These were more attentive to the interests of the church than the earlier Merovingian rulers had been. Pepin, mayor of the palace (687–714), founded more than twenty bishoprics and bestowed vast territorial possessions on the church.

Charles Martel, mayor of the palace (714–741), conquered the Saracens in 733, and more completely in 739, when he drove them from Provence. Charles Martel dealt with ecclesiastical endowments as with any other portion of the royal domain. He gave to his liege Milo, the archbishoprics of Rheims and Treves; to his nephew Hugh, the archbishoprics of Rouen, Paris, and Bayeux, with the abbeys of Fontenelle and Jumieges. After exercising the functions of royalty for years, Pepin assumed the royal title in 752.

1. Wishing to secure for himself the moral support of the papacy, Pepin got himself crowned first by Archbishop Boniface, with the consent of the pope, and afterward by the pope himself (Stephen III.) in 753.

2. There was an agreement entered into by pope and archbishop on the one hand, and Pepin on the other, that the latter should aid the former in extirpating paganism and heresy, and that the former should use all their influence in favor of Pepin's civil authority.

3. The position of the papacy at this time was such as to make an alliance of this kind peculiarly welcome. The exarchate of Ravenna, which had represented the authority of the Eastern empire in the West and had afforded a certain amount of protection to the popes, was overthrown in 753 by Aistulph, the Lombard. The pope tried in vain to secure from Aistulph a recognition of his sovereignty over the Duchy of Rome. Failing in this, the pope now betook himself to the court of Pepin, where the following treaty was made: Pepin, his sons, his court, and his nobles, swore to secure ample satisfaction for the pope and the church, and engaged to reduce the Lombards to submission and to insist on the fullest restitution of all the rights and possessions of the papacy in Italy. Stephen proclaimed Pepin and Bertrada king and queen of the Franks, and bestowed the royal dignity on Carlman and Charles, their sons. Pursuant to this agreement, Pepin invaded Lombardy in 754 and compelled the restoration of a part of the territory claimed by the pope.

4. Charles (afterward known as Charlemagne or Charles the Great) became joint king with Carlman in 768, sole king in 792. By favoring circumstances and

great military and administrative ability, he succeeded in vastly extending the Frankish domains and in consolidating his acquisitions. Charles carried out the policy of Pepin with reference to the papacy. He regarded the relation of Church and State as that of mutual helpfulness. The State was to honor and protect the Church, and discipline it if need be; the Church was to aid the State in maintaining unity and order. To the hierarchy he accorded the greater degree of sanctity, and he was willing to receive the imperial crown at the hands of a pope; but to the civil power belonged practical supremacy in both civil and ecclesiastical matters. The Capitularies of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious are taken up far more with ecclesiastical than with civil legislation.

5. The growth of the papal power went hand in hand with that of the Carlovingians. The Catholic missionary had the full support of the civil arm in his effort to overcome heresy and paganism. When gentler means proved unavailing, the Church did not hesitate to ask, nor the State to accord, the use of forcible measures. Bishops were given a recognized administrative position, side by side with civil officials, whose jurisdiction covered the same territory, and each was expected to co-operate heartily with the other. The *Holy Catholic Church* and the *Holy Roman Empire* were regarded as the counterpart one of the other, and each had before it the dominion of the world as its goal.

6. Both Pepin and Charlemagne were imposed upon, perhaps not unwillingly, by the forged "Donation of Constantine." The popes based their claim to the territory that the Lombards had deprived them of upon a document that was long ago proved to be a forgery, in accordance with which Constantine had bestowed large territorial possessions upon Pope Sylvester and his successors. It is possible that the Carlovingians would have bestowed these possessions on the church without the production of this spurious document, but the influence of the document was probably considerable.

7. Charlemagne wrought assiduously and systematically for the revival of learning. He brought into Gaul the best scholars to be found in Britain and elsewhere, and gave a great impulse to education. This proved

highly advantageous to the church, as the educational work was left entirely in the hands of the clergy.

X. THE CHRISTIANITY OF BRITAIN IN RELATION TO THE PAPACY.

LITERATURE: Works of Gildas, Beda, Nennius; "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle"; Haddan and Stubbs, "Councils and Eccl. Doc. rel. to Gr. Brit. and Ireland"; Maclear, "Conv. of the West" ("The English," "The Celts"); Bright, "Ear. Eng. Ch. Hist."; Pryce, "Anc. Br. Ch."; McLaughlan, "Ear. Scot. Ch."; Stokes, "Irel. and the Celt. Ch."; Collins, "The Beginnings of Eng. Christianity," 1898; Mason, "The Mission of St. Augustine according to the Original Documents"; Wilson, "The Mission of St. Augustine"; Lightfoot, "Leaders of the Northern Church"; Haverfield, "Early Brit. Christianity" ("Eng. Hist. Rev.", July, 1896); Bund, "Celtic Ch. in Wales," 1898; Loofs, "*De Antiqua Britonum Scotorumque Ecclesia*"; Skene, "Celtic Scotland"; Rhys, "Celtic Britain"; Cathcart, "Ancient British and Irish Churches"; German works on the Iro-Scottish Ch., Boniface, etc., by Ebrard, Förster, Fischer, Werner, Müller, etc.; Hauck, "*D. Kirchengesch. d. Deutschlands,*" *Bd.* I., second ed., 1898; Greenwood, Vol. II., pp. 289–343; Milman, Vol. II., pp. 175–235; Schaff, Vol. IV., p. 19, *seq.;* encyclopedia articles on the leading personages.

The traditions in accordance with which Christianity was introduced into Britain during the apostolic age are unhistorical. It is impossible to determine the exact date or manner of the conversion of the Britons. It was probably in connection with the Roman army, and as early as the latter part of the second century. There are some indications of the influence of Gallic Christianity, which, through Irenæus, came directly from the East. By the beginning of the fourth century Christianity had attained to considerable influence in Britain. Several British bishops sat in the Synod of Arles (314), and still more in the Council of Ariminium in 350. There is no evidence that any Britons sat in the Nicene Council (325). Pelagius and his disciples, Faustus and Fastidius, are said to have been Britons, and Cœlestius, another leading disciple, was probably a Scot. Whether the early British Christianity was Pelagian in character is uncertain. After the withdrawal of the Roman army from Britain, about 410, there was little intercourse between the British Christians and those under the influence of Rome. About 449 the Angles, Saxons, Jutes, etc., from the continent, began to invade Britain. The British Christians were gradually forced westward into the mountain fastnesses of Wales, and here they organized themselves in a semi-monastic way for Christian life and work. They seem to have formed themselves into vast communities, each presided over by an abbot. These institutions were conducted in a communistic manner. Each individual seems to have been assigned to that kind of work for which he was supposed to be best fitted. A large number devoted themselves to study, and the Bible was their chief text-book. Their teachings in the fourth century do not seem to have been more primitive than those of the Gallic Christians with whom they were closely associated. Their semi-monastic organization was probably a perpetuation of the Celtic clan system.

1. *Peculiarities of the British Christians.*

Information on this point is exceedingly scanty. When an effort was made, about the close of the sixth century, to bring them into subjection to Rome, they were found to be very tenacious of their practices. From the records of the discussions that took place between the emissaries of Rome and the leaders of the British Christians we may deduce the following statement: (1) Diocesan episcopacy did not exist. (2) Great attention was given to the study of the Scriptures, numerous semi-monastic colleges having been established for the promotion of Bible study and Christian life. (3) They were full of missionary zeal and were doing an extensive and successful missionary work among the Picts of the North, in France and in Germany. (4) They absolutely refused to recognize human authority in matters of religion, indignantly repelling the efforts put forth to bring them into subjection to the pope. (5) They insisted upon humility and simplicity in Christian life, and were offended by the pomp and worldliness of the Romish missionaries. (6) They differed from the Romanists in several matters, *e. g.*, as to the time of celebrating Easter, the mode of baptism, tonsure, etc.

These differences do not seem at all fundamental. The Britons followed the Eastern method of reckoning in regard to Easter. The

[illegible] — the [illegible] Christianity
[illegible] to Romanism

point at issue respecting baptism was probably single *vs.* trine immersion. That the Britons should refuse to recognize the authority of any foreign prelate was natural, and their uncompromising rejection of proposals in this direction was due in part to their determination to be independent, in part to their belief that alliance with Rome would involve submission to their mortal enemies the Saxons, and in part, perhaps, to their opposition to hierarchical church government of any kind. It should be remarked that it was the Iro-Scottish Celts rather than the British that engaged so largely in missionary work. The Britons proper seem to have made no attempt to evangelize the Saxons. Perhaps they could hardly have been expected to labor for the spiritual well-being of those who had driven them from their homes and destroyed so many of their kindred. The Scottish Christians labored among the northern Teutonic settlements of England zealously and successfully.

2. *Roman Interference.*

In 596 Gregory the Great, who before his elevation to the papal chair had intended to go to Britain with a view to converting the Saxons, sent thither Augustine, a monk, together with about thirty other monkish missionaries, including some Frankish interpreters. By making a parade of ascetical life, by pretended miracles, and by promises of earthly advantages, they succeeded in converting Ethelbert, king of the Saxons, who with about ten thousand followers received baptism in a river at the hands of the missionaries. A firm alliance having been formed between the king and the Roman See, the missionaries addressed themselves to the far more difficult task of subjecting the British Christians to Rome. When all other means proved unavailing, they persuaded the Saxon king to make an expedition against them. Three thousand of the British Christians were slaughtered on one occasion. For centuries the Christians of the old British type, in Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, as well as in various parts of Germany, resisted with all their might the encroachments of Rome, and it is probable that Christianity of this type was never wholly exterminated.

Ethelbert was no doubt already favorably inclined toward Christianity because of Bertha, his Frankish Christian wife, who had been allowed to have a Frankish chaplain. The methods employed by Augustine savor of imposture, but he had doubtless reached the conviction that deceit in a good cause is allowable. Ethelbert was not disposed to force his subjects to accept Christianity. "Only he treated believers with a closer affection as fellow-citizens with him in the kingdom of heaven."[1] By 601 a thorough organization had been effected, Augustine having been constituted archbishop, and a number of churches and monasteries having been established.

3. *British Missions.*

Nothing is more characteristic of the early British Christians than their zeal and success in missionary work. In no country and in no age do we find the missionary spirit more active and aggressive. A brief account of the careers of the three most eminent missionary leaders is all that can be here attempted.

(1) *Patrick*, born in Britain about 400, son of a deacon, grandson of a priest, taken captive by Irish pirates when about sixteen years of age, having been released from captivity and educated in theology, was seized with an irresistible desire to carry the gospel to the heathen Irish. Whether he received part of his theological education at the monastery of Lerins in Gaul is by no means certain. Later Roman Catholic writers have sought to make it appear that he received a commission from the pope to evangelize the Irish. His own writings make no mention of such commission, and it is highly improbable that he consulted the pope with reference to his great life-work. Going into Ireland with a few coadjutors, about 432, he labored for many years with wonderful zeal and success, evangelized more or less thoroughly the whole of Ireland, and left a reputation for sanctity of life and spiritual power that entitles him to be considered one of the greatest of missionaries.

It cannot be supposed, of course, that any very large proportion of the multitudes that nominally accepted Christianity on his invitation and submitted to baptism at his hands actually experienced saving grace. It is probable that in many cases chieftains were persuaded by Patrick's earnest advocacy that Christianity was better than their heathen cult, and that they adopted it outwardly without any marked transformation of character. Clansmen seem to have been ever ready to follow their leaders in such matters. It was Patrick's powerful personality that enabled him so easily to master the Irish clans and to fill them with partisan zeal against paganism. But the converts of Patrick seem to have been no less fierce and resentful than their pagan neighbors.

(2) Equally worthy of admiration is the missionary

---

[1] Bede, Bk. I., Ch. 26.

activity of *Columba*, "Irish by birth, Irish by education, Irish in his life's work and devotion," born in 521, educated at the monastic school of Clonard (famous at that time for learning and Christian zeal), he spent the earlier years of his life in mission work in Ireland, where he is said to have planted hundreds of churches. Expelled from Ireland for having occasioned a war that resulted in the slaughter of about three thousand of his enemies, he went as a missionary to the Picts in Scotland, by whom the Irish colony of Dalraida was in danger of being oppressed or destroyed. He succeeded, against much Druidical opposition, in securing the conversion of the king of the Picts, and through his influence was enabled to plant Christian churches throughout Scotland. He made Iona, a small island, his headquarters, and had mastered the language of the Picts and converted his near neighbors before undertaking his great work. In the conversion of the Picts he had the co-operation of several Picts who had received their training in Ireland and who spoke the language fluently. Columba was a great politician as well as a great missionary, and on more than one occasion his influence was of momentous importance.

(3) *Columban* is worthy of being placed by the side of Patrick and Columba. Born in Leinster, Ireland, in 543, educated at Bangor, one of the most famous monastic colleges of the age, he spent his active life in planting evangelical churches in Burgundy, Switzerland, and Northern Italy. In fact, the influence of his work may be said to have extended throughout the Rhine region of Germany and the Netherlands. His extant writings show that he was one of the most accomplished men of the age, and his devotion to mission work was admirable. About 585, with thirteen companions, he went to Burgundy, where he was kindly received by rulers and people. He founded, one after another, three great monastic mission stations, which formed the centers of the most self-denying mission work extending over a wide territory. The high moral standard of the lives and teachings of Columban and his followers contrasts strikingly with those of the Gallic clergy who were in alliance with Rome. Columban's John-the-Baptist-like denunciation of the immoralities of the court and his

resolute refusal to abandon the peculiarities of the Irish Church in favor of those of the Roman and the Gallic brought upon him the enmity of court and clergy, and after about twenty years of labor, when about sixty years old, he was driven from Burgundy. With a body of faithful companions he made his way up the Rhine to Switzerland, and founded a number of stations in that region. Here his enemies after a few years again molested him. Leaving an undying influence behind him, he went to Northern Italy, where in his old age he formed another center of mission work. In many respects Columban was the greatest and best of the Irish missionaries, and the influence of his work, and that of those who were like-minded with him, remained until it was violently suppressed by the Carlovingian rulers and the Roman missionaries of a later time; nay, there is reason to think that it was never wholly lost, but after a period of latency reappeared in the evangelical parties of the Middle Ages. It is a remarkable fact that those very regions in which the Iro-Scottish mission work was most successful during the sixth and seventh centuries were precisely the regions in which the evangelical sects of the later times flourished most. There was no doubt much in the methods of these missionaries that we should scarcely approve, but considering the age and the circumstances in which they lived we must pronounce their lives marvels of Christian heroism.

It would be a mistake to suppose that the doctrines, practices, or missionary methods of the Iro-Scottish Christians of the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries were in every respect apostolic or in accord with modern evangelical ideas. They represent a far more primitive type of Christian life and thought than that of the Roman Church of the time of Gregory the Great; but it was the Christianity of the beginning of the fourth century rather than that of the first that they perpetuated. Even this was modified, as might have been expected, by the national characteristics and the sociological conditions of the primitive peoples of the British Isles. While they rejected the Roman hierarchy and had no very elaborate hierarchical organization of their own, their leaders, like Patrick, Columba, and Columban, were arbitrary and autocratic in the highest degree. They seem to have been completely free from Mariolatry and saint-worship in every form, and from every kind of idolatry. They seem to have recognized no authority outside of the Scriptures. But their views of the Christian ordinances seem to have been those of the third or fourth century rather than those of the apostles; their views of Christian life were highly ascetical; they laid great stress upon the observance of their rigorous monastic rules, enforcing absolute obedience to superiors, silence during protracted periods, abstinence from any but the plainest foods, the infliction of corporal punishment for the infraction of even the least important rules, etc. Columban's rules, that have been preserved in apparently authentic form, do not differ greatly in their tone from those that prevailed in the Roman Catholic Church of the time.[1]

XI. THE ADVANCEMENT OF PAPAL DOMINION THROUGH MISSIONARY ENDEAVOR.

LITERATURE: In addition to literature referred to in the preceding section, see works of Gregory the Great, Boniface (Winfrid), and Charlemagne; Willibald, "*Vita Bonifacii*"; recent monographs on Boniface by Cox, 1853, J. P. Müller, 1869, Werner, 1875, Pfaler, 1880, Buss, 1880, Fischer, 1882, Ebrard, 1882, Loofs, 1881, Hahn, 1883; Hauck, "*Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*," second ed., *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 432–578; encyclopedia articles on the persons concerned.

1. *Great Romish Missionaries.*

Reference has been made in an earlier section to the efforts of Gregory the Great to extend the dominion of the Roman Catholic Church through an organized missionary propaganda, and to the conversion of the Saxons in Britain through his emissary, Augustine. Within a few years a well-organized and well-equipped State Church, enthusiastically devoted to Rome and the pope, had been developed in the extensive Saxon dominions. Large numbers of monasteries had been formed, in which, as in the similar institutions of the Iro-Scottish Christians, zeal for learning was combined with missionary enthusiasm. Nowhere during the seventh and eighth centuries was Roman Catholicism so vigorous and aggressive as in Britain. It was from the Anglo-Saxon monasteries that most of the great missionaries to the continent of Europe went forth, and to them Charlemagne was to look for leaders in the great educational movement that he inaugurated in the early years of the next period.

(1) *Augustine.* An account has already been given of his attempt, first by diplomacy and afterward by armed force, to subject the ancient British Christians to the

---

[1] See the monastic rules of Columban in critical text edited by Seebass, in "*Zeitschrift f. Kirchengesch.*," 1896, *Seit.* 218, *seq.*

Roman Church and to the newly-Christianized Saxons. An estimate of his character as a missionary may here be given. Having succeeded in winning to the Catholic faith King Ethelbert, which virtually meant the winning of his entire people, he returned to Gaul, where in accordance with the wish of Gregory the Great he was consecrated "Archbishop for the English people," November, 597. In 601 Gregory granted him a pall, gave him directions for drawing up a liturgy, and counseled the establishment of several other dioceses (London, York, etc.).

If complete success in the accomplishment of a vast undertaking is a criterion of greatness, Augustine was assuredly a great missionary. But if we are to judge of him by his correspondence with Gregory the Great, the impression is by no means so favorable. It is taken up largely with the asking of paltry questions as to the conduct of his work, which a great enlightened Christian leader might have been expected to settle promptly and independently. In nothing do we see more clearly the fundamental difference between the Romish missionary and the Iro-Scottish than in the scrupulosity with which the former looked to Rome for directions in the most trivial matters. A spirit of abject obedience to his great superior characterized the work of Augustine from beginning to end. This presupposed as the guiding principle of his life, he did his work with the utmost fidelity and with remarkable success. "At his coming in 597 the English people were entirely heathen; when he died the Church of the English was an accomplished fact."[1] But it must not be overlooked, as the author just quoted also points out, that "a very large part of England—possibly the larger part—was converted from the north," that is, by the Iro-Scottish missionaries.[2] Augustine died in 604.

(2) *Willibrord.* Under the Merovingian rulers of the first half of the seventh century, Lothair II. and Dagobert I., the people of Friesland were to some extent brought under the influence of Christianity; but the temporary decline of the Frankish power led to the

---

[1] Collins, "The Beginnings of Eng. Christianity," p. 73.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 97, *seq.*

throwing off of the government and the religion of their oppressors. It is not likely that the Catholic evangelization of the Frisians had ever gone very far, and the number that had been brought under the influence of the Iro-Scottish missionaries was probably small. In 690, the year of Willibrord's arrival at the mouth of the Rhine, the land was virtually heathen. Willibrord, b. 658 in Northumberland, England, son of an Anglo-Saxon religious enthusiast and ascetic named Wilgils, was brought up in a monastery that had been founded by King Alchfrid for Iro-Scottish monks but had been transferred by him to Wilfrid, a zealous Catholic. In 678 he left Ripon, probably on account of the expulsion of Wilfrid by the king, and betook himself to Ireland, where he spent twelve years under the guidance of the noted ascetic leaders, Egbert and Wigbert. By Egbert he was sent in 690, with eleven companions, for the conversion of the Frisians. The Franks, under Pepin, had just restored, in a measure, their authority over the Frisians, and were ready to give protection and support to the Anglo-Saxon missionaries. But the subjugation of the liberty-loving people had intensified their hatred of Christianity (Roman Catholicism), and Willibrord felt that the chances were small of winning them to the faith. He first betook himself to Pepin to consult about the work to be undertaken and the means to be employed. Afterward he visited Rome in order to secure papal co-operation. Armed with the authority of the Frankish king and the pope, he returned to his work, and by 693 the success of the missionaries had been so great that they chose one of their number, Suidbert, bishop, and sent him to England to be ordained by Wilfrid. This seems to have been displeasing to Pepin, who insisted that Willibrord should be the religious leader, and should proceed to Rome for ordination as archbishop of Frankish Friesland (695).

Willibrord had been brought up to regard the authority of the pope as supreme, and on this occasion he put himself absolutely at the disposal of the Roman pontiff, sought his permission to enter upon the work of evangelizing the Frisians and his blessing upon the work, and obtained from him relics for the churches to be founded. The Anglo-Saxons were at this time far in advance of the Frankish Christians in their zeal for papal authority as well as in missionary enthusiasm and in learning.

Returning to Friesland fully equipped with royal and papal authority and support, the work of organizing an ecclesiastical system, building churches, educating ministers, etc., advanced with wonderful rapidity. Pepin believed that in no way could his political authority be rendered so stable as by the establishment of organized Christianity in obedience to himself and the pope, and he bestowed unsparingly of his means for the promotion of the work of the Anglo-Saxon missionaries. Willibrord and his associates did not confine their propaganda to Frankish Friesland, but the neighboring regions of Germany were also brought under their influence.

The independent portion of Friesland repelled with decision every effort for their evangelization, identifying, as they did, Christianity with Frankish dominion. Willibrord's efforts for the conversion of the Danes were not more successful. But so great was his zeal that no failure could quench it. In the island of Heligoland he sought to break down the superstition of the natives by baptizing a convert in a sacred spring and narrowly escaped the fury of the outraged mob.

That the success of Willibrord and his associates was chiefly external and material, and that the masses of the Frisians were still bitterly antagonistic to Frankish rule and political Christianity, became fully manifest after the death of Pepin (714). The Frisians joined hands with the enemies of Charles Martel, the Frisian church organism fell to pieces, Willibrord fled the country, priests were hunted down, many church buildings were destroyed, and relapse into paganism was almost complete.

A change in political conditions enabled Willibrord to return to his work with the full support of Charles Martel, who had re-established his authority in Friesland.

In 734 Charles Martel subjugated the independent Frisians, destroyed their pagan sanctuaries and forced Christianity upon the population.

Willibrord died in 739, having been permitted to see the whole of Friesland brought into subjection to the Roman hierarchy, and nominally Christian. But a general return to heathenism succeeded his death.

(3) *Boniface* (Winfrid). Of still greater importance was the work of the Anglo-Saxon monk Winfrid, commonly known as Boniface, "the Apostle of the Germans." Son of a Wessex noble (~~born c. 672), he early left his~~ uncongenial home to enter a monastery at Exeter, situated on the border between the Saxon and the British populations. The Abbot Wynbert was devout and learned and was often employed by the king in drafting public documents. Winfrid made rapid progress in learning and enjoyed the favor of the archbishop and the nobles. He had already been entrusted with important diplomatic work, and had he chosen to remain in England a distinguished career would almost certainly have been open to him. His gifts were those of an ecclesiastical statesman.

But the missionary enthusiasm, characteristic alike of the Iro-Scottish and the Anglo-Saxon Christians of this age, impelled him to turn his back upon fatherland and politico-ecclesiastical position and to devote his life unreservedly to the Christianization of the heathen peoples of the Continent. He had become thoroughly imbued with the idea that the well-being of Christendom depends upon the unity of the church under the lordship of the pope, and he believed that the most expeditious way of securing the conversion of pagan peoples was by bringing them into subjection to Catholic princes and compelling them to abandon all idolatrous practices and to accept outwardly at least the forms of Christianity.

He visited Rome (718), entered into the most confidential relations with Gregory II., and received from him authority to conduct missionary work among the heathen populations of Germany. He undertook to administer baptism according to the Roman custom and to refer all difficulties that might arise to Rome. He had already conceived the idea of a thoroughly organized and magnificently equipped German Church in complete subjection to the papacy.

Thuringia was already to a considerable extent Chris~~tian, but a large~~ proportion of the churches were of the Iro-Scottish type and did not recognize the authority of Rome, while heathen rites were still openly performed by the pagan population. Boniface, as a papal emissary, sought by negotiations with the nobles and clergy to secure the prohibition of independent forms of Christianity and of pagan practices.

Next he visited Charles Martel in order to secure his co-operation in the work of ecclesiastical reformation in Thuringia. But his work in Thuringia was interrupted by what seemed to him a providential opportunity for successful work among the Frisians in the death of King Radbod, the enemy of Frankish rule and religion.

For three years (719–722) he labored under Willibrord and received further preparation for his work in Southern and Central Germany. Willibrord sought to make him a bishop and connect him permanently with the Frisian work; but he preferred to labor elsewhere.

Hesse for a time occupied his attention. Here the mass of the population was still pagan and had suffered greatly from Saxon incursions. Boniface and his associates knew how to adapt themselves to the wretched condition of the people. Living in the most abject poverty, they went from place to place preaching the gospel, or what purported to be such, and multitudes professed conversion and were baptized into the Roman Catholic faith. Never did Boniface labor with greater success.

Throughout his career he kept in the closest touch with the pope, professing complete dependence and unconditional obedience, and asking for minute instructions with regard to every important proceeding. Revisiting Rome after the Hessian mission, he received episcopal consecration and was clothed with all needful authority for the great work he was about to undertake (722 or 723).

The work laid out for him by the pope was the conversion of the remaining heathen in the eastern Frankish provinces and the subjugation to Rome of all erroneous forms of Christianity. Not only were there large numbers of Christians of the Iro-Scottish type in these regions, but many of the Frankish Catholics fell far short of Boniface's ideal of true obedience to the pope. Charles Martel seconded his efforts with money, lands, and military force. His brethren in England supported his mission with money, books, and workers. East Franconia, Bavaria, Thuringia, and Hesse were the principal scenes of his activity.

By 731 most of the Christian opposition to papal authority in these provinces had been overcome and heathenism had been forcibly suppressed. Vast numbers of churches and monasteries had been erected, immense territorial possessions had been acquired, and southern and central Germany had been covered by organized Roman Catholicism. He was now consecrated archbishop by Gregory III. (732), and a number of well-endowed bishoprics were established: four in Bavaria,—Salzburg, Freising, Passau, and Regensburg (739), and four in Central Germany,—Würzburg, Buraburg, Erfurt, and Eichstädt (742). The principal monasteries founded under Boniface were those at Erfurt, Fritzlar, Ohrdurf, Bishofsheim, Homburg, and Fulda.

In 743 the archiepiscopal dignity was definitely affixed to the See of Mainz. With Mainz as his center of administration, he supervised ecclesiastical matters from Cologne to Switzerland and from Austria to Belgium.

In 744 Boniface, with the co-operation of Pepin III., assembled a synod for West Franconia at Soissons, which condemned the chief opponents of the organized Catholicism for which he stood, enacted laws for the abolition of many ecclesiastical abuses, and in general confirmed Boniface's policy of a unified and organized ecclesiastical system supported by the Frankish rulers and absolutely obedient to the pope. Twenty-three bishops were present, besides a number of civil dignitaries. Pepin gave legal force to the decrees of the synod.

[illegible]

In 747 he assembled his last synod, in which the complete subjection of the German Church to Rome was, if possible, still more energetically expressed.

In 753 the aged missionary laid aside his archiepiscopal dignity, appointed Lullus, a faithful disciple, to administer the affairs of the German Church, and once more went forth to evangelize the heathen. Friesland had relapsed into heathenism, and it was his earnest desire to win it to Christ and the church. His labors were not crowned with success, and in 755 he was murdered by the heathen.

The greatness of the achievements of this Anglo-Saxon missionary is undeniable. That he was an ecclesiastical statesman of the first rank must be admitted by all. That he was an intolerant and bigoted papist, and that he subordinated everything else to the securing of papal dominion, is clear from his own writings and the writings of his contemporaries. It is doubtful whether any pope did so much for the advancement of papal absolutism as did this Anglo-Saxon monk. Circumstances were no doubt favorable just at this time for the completion of the Christianization and the politico-ecclesiastical organization of Germany; but only a man of genius could have wrought the wonderful changes that occurred in the generation 722–755. That he extirpated a large amount of Christian life of a more evangelical type than his own, and that he incorporated in his politico-ecclesiastical system a vast amount of unregenerate pagan life, is certain. Whether he is to be regarded as a benefactor or a malefactor will depend upon our opinion as to the desirability or the undesirability of a State-Church system covering the whole ground and bringing the entire population under its influence. The establishment of such a system, in complete subjection to the pope, was in Boniface's opinion the means by which paganism and heresy could best be overcome and Christianity made triumphant.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHRISTIAN WORLD AT THE CLOSE OF THE PERIOD

I. THE EAST AND THE WEST

DIFFERENCES between Oriental and Occidental Christianity have been repeatedly referred to in the foregoing chapters. These differences were no doubt due in part to ethnological characteristics which science has as yet only partially explained, and in part to the different social and political conditions by which Christianity was environed in the East and the West respectively. The East had been covered and exploited by great despotisms for thousands of years, and civilization was already in a stagnant and declining state when Christianity appeared. The Macedonian empire had spread the civilization of Greece and had awakened a considerable amount of intellectual activity. The Roman rule had given a measure of temporary relief to the Eastern peoples from galling oppression. But the Roman Empire itself, especially after the time of Constantine, had taken on the character of an Oriental despotism, and there was no place for aggressiveness in Christian life and thought. The Eastern empire not only lost its control of Italy, Northern Africa, the Mediterranean Islands, Illyricum, and of course the provinces of Western Europe, through barbarian conquest, but the encroachments first of the Persians and afterward of the Saracens had by the end of this period restricted its dominion to Asia Minor, Thrace, a portion of Macedonia, and a portion of Greece. The narrowing of the empire involved the gradual receding of Christian influence from the alienated territory. The Christianity of the East was already too corrupt and unaggressive to make any serious efforts at winning the conquerors, and was content to be tolerated and to become still further fossilized by inactivity. It is one of the strangest and saddest facts of history that the land that gave birth to Christianity, and the lands in which the apostles labored so abundantly, should have become so completely lost to Christian influence as now to constitute mission fields of the most discouraging character.

In the West, on the other hand, the dissolution of the Roman Empire, while it was accompanied by a decline of learning and a temporary loss of much of the older civilization, was succeeded by the rapid growth of a new and better civilization made up of the remnants of the Græco-Roman, of the institutions of the vigorous and aggressive and liberty-loving Teutonism of the conquering tribes, and of Christianity corrupted but still aggressive and ready for every opportunity to increase its influence. The readiness with which the Teutonic peoples accepted Christianity in the form in which it was presented to them is as remarkable as the utter insusceptibility to Christian influence of the Oriental conquerors of the Eastern empire. The Frankish empire, at the close of this period (under Charlemagne) embracing the territory now covered by Italy, France, Belgium, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and a large part of that covered by Germany and Austria, was in the closest alliance with the Roman Catholic Church, and wished to be regarded as the Holy Roman Empire. Still more remarkable is it that Christianity, an Oriental religion, should have had its chief development among Occidental peoples.

The period closes with Eastern Christianity divided into several parties, each contending most strenuously for some minute point of doctrine and anathematizing the rest and all alike tending to become stagnant, and with Western Christianity tending to become uniform, with a powerful and comprehensive organization, and with the great mass of the population of central and western Europe already nominally Christian and ready to be molded by the powerful hierarchy that centered in Rome.

A few more definite points of comparison between Eastern and Western Christianity may not be out of place.

1. *Doctrinal Development.* The Eastern theology was speculative and transcendental (Origenistic, Arian, Apollinarian, Nestorian, Eutychian, Monothelite controversies) and Eastern theologians took little interest in the great

practical anthropological questions that agitated the West (Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian controversies). The interest of the West in the great Christological controversies was slight and almost limited to their practical, political aspects. Greek theology received its character largely from Greek philosophy; Latin theology was greatly influenced by Roman law.

2. *Church Polity.* The Eastern churches did little after the Nicene age in the way of developing church polity. The emperors, beginning with Constantine, undertook the control of ecclesiastical affairs, and there was little opportunity for initiative on the part of prelates. For imperial purposes it was convenient to have the ecclesiastical system center in the patriarch of Constantinople; but this official was the creature of the emperor and could be deposed at his will. The development of the Roman hierarchy was rapid and striking and constitutes one of the most remarkable features of Western Christianity.

3. *Monasticism.* Nothing better illustrates the fundamental differences between Eastern and Western Christianity than a comparison of Eastern and Western monasticism. Monasticism, as an outgrowth of the ascetical spirit, was a product of Eastern Christianity influenced by Oriental pagan practices and modes of thought. Eastern monasticism was intensely ascetical and in its better form contemplative and speculative; but, like Oriental Christianity in general, it soon became stagnant and devoid of initiative. Missionary zeal has been manifest among Oriental monks only in isolated cases and in slight measure. In the West, great monastic orders, like the Benedictines, spread themselves over Europe and became the pioneers of civilization. The aggressive work of the Roman Catholic Church from the time of Gregory the Great has been done almost exclusively by monks. Whenever an emergency has arisen that existing orders have seemed incapable of meeting, new orders have sprung into existence peculiarly adapted to the work to be done. No such phenomenon appears in connection with Eastern monasticism, where all is stagnation.

4. *The Ordinances.* The Eastern Church was content to perpetuate the stage of development that had been

reached by the Nicene age. Trine immersion was still almost universal at that time. This became the stereotyped form in the Eastern Church, whereas the Western Church has felt perfectly free to vary the mode of baptism to suit its convenience. The use of the cup by the laity and infant communion have been perpetuated by the Eastern Church, but disused by the Western. In its doctrine and its practice with regard to the ordinances the Western Church has allowed itself the utmost freedom, while the Eastern has adhered rigorously to the teaching and practice of the fourth and fifth centuries. So also in confirmation, extreme unction, and other rites.

5. *Liturgical Development*. Here also the Eastern Church has remained almost stationary since the fifth century, but the Western has allowed itself the utmost freedom in the development of its forms of worship and in its use of church music.

6. *The Use of Painting and Sculpture for Religious Purposes*. It has been noticed that early Christianity rejected entirely the use of art in connection with religion. With the paganization of Christianity came the use of images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, the apostles, and noted saints and martyrs, and this use of images became scarcely distinguishable from pagan idolatry. The great uprising in the East against image worship (Iconoclastic controversy), under Persian and Mohammedan influence, was settled by the triumph of image worship. The Oriental Church restricted the use of images to pictorial representations, and these to conventionalized forms. The result has been the mechanical reproduction of the representations of Christ, Mary, the apostles, etc., that were in use at the time of the controversy. These inartistic pictures are still regarded with the greatest reverence.

In the West little interest was taken in the Iconoclastic controversy, and pictures were freely used, not, it was said, to be worshiped, but as a means of commemorating the deeds of the heroes of the faith, and instructing and inspiring the people. They were regarded as useful but not necessary, and the reverence paid to them probably fell considerably short, in most minds, of idolatry. The Roman Catholic Church has not conventionalized its images, and allows the fullest scope to the genius of painters and sculptors alike in idealizing the lineaments of Christ and the saints. While the use of images in the Roman Catholic Church can scarcely be regarded as free from superstition and idolatry, it has never sunk so low as the iconolatry of the East. The Roman Catholic Church has from the Middle Ages onward been a chief promoter of art.

7. *Eastern and Western Sects.* In the earlier time Gnosticism, Ebionism, Montanism, Manichæism, Sabellianism, and Arianism, all had their origin and chief development in the East, whereas Novatianism and Donatism were the products of the West. Early Eastern sects were speculative, early Western sects were practical in their origin and in their tendency. Out of the great Christological controversies of the East grew a number of mutually antagonistic parties or denominations: Nestorians, Monophysites (Jacobite, Coptic, and Abyssinian divisions), Maronites, Gregorians (orthodox Armenian Christians), which at the time of their separation each became fossilized and practically insusceptible of further internal development or of modification by external religious influences.

In the West the case is quite different. The older parties gradually vanished in the face of organized Catholicism. Donatism persisted with vigor in Northern Africa until the Arianized Vandals broke its power. Arianism, that had won to Christianity the Teutonic tribes (Goths, Vandals, Franks, etc.), speedily disappeared through the diplomacy of the bishops of Rome. It is doubtful whether Arianism as a speculative form of Christianity ever had any foothold among the Teutonic peoples. It happened to be the form in which Christianity was first presented to them, its general features were in accord with their modes of thought, and it was made acceptable to them by the bearing of its preachers. But these rude peoples were little concerned about the metaphysical subtleties that agitated the East. When interest demanded co-operation with the bishop of Rome, the princes were ready to drop Arianism and with their people to become Catholics. Pelagianism can scarcely be said to have become organized into a sect. The same is true of Priscillianism. The ancient Celtic Christians

(British and Iro-Scottish) represented, as compared with the Roman Catholicism of the time, an earlier stage of Christian development under different surroundings, and they long strenuously opposed the pretensions of the popes and sought to propagate their more primitive type of Christianity on the continent of Europe. But these too were obliged to yield to the aggressive politico-ecclesiastical organization that had its center in Rome and its head in the papacy.

By the close of the present period organized opposition to ecclesiastical unity and centralized ecclesiastical government was almost at an end. Corruption and oppression in ecclesiastical life and administration would hereafter provoke widespread revolt, and evangelical parties almost exterminated in the onward sweep of the great politico-ecclesiastical organism would reappear later with vigor and effect. But for the time Catholic unity was well-nigh realized in the West, while Eastern Christianity was hopelessly divided and without a great centralizing force.

II. LITERATURE AND LEARNING.

The intellectual and literary activity that marked the close of the preceding period received a great impetus from the favorable conditions attending the conversion of Constantine and the ultimate union of Church and State. In the East appeared great theologians, like Eusebius, Athanasius, Apollinaris, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, Cyril of Alexandria, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, and John of Damascus, the greatest systematizer of the period. The theological schools of Alexandria and Antioch flourished, and new ones were founded at Edessa and Nisibis. But many Christian students of position and means were not content with the learning to be acquired in Christian institutions, but resorted to great pagan teachers at Athens, Alexandria, and elsewhere.

Bishop of Milan.

The West produced such theologians, preachers, and religious leaders as Ambrose, Augustine, Pelagius, Julian and Cœlestius (Pelagians), Faustus (Manichæan), and Leo the Great and Gregory the Great.

From the middle of the fifth century learning steadily declined in the West, while in the East intellectual stagnation set in and little of value was produced.

The Anglo-Saxon Christians became the chief conservators of learning and of missionary enthusiasm for the West. The most noted of the Anglo-Saxon theologians of this period are the Venerable Bede (d. 735) and Alcuin (d. 804). A certain amount of educational work was carried on in the monasteries throughout the East and the West, but nowhere with such vigor as in England and Ireland at the close of this period.

A comparatively rich hymnology grew up during this period in the Greek and Latin churches alike. Among the most noted of the Greek hymnists are Anatolius (died *c.* 458), John of Damascus (died *c.* 780), and Cosmas of Jerusalem (died *c.* 760). John and Cosmas were foster-brothers, members of the same monastery, and closely associated in literary labors. They were extreme ascetics, zealous saint-worshipers, and enthusiastic opponents of iconoclasm.

Among the Latin hymnists of this period may be mentioned Ambrose of Milan (d. 397), Venantius Fortunatus (died *c.* 609), Gregory the Great (d. 604), and the Venerable Bede.

For full bibliography of the Greek and Latin hymnology of the period see Schaff, Vol. IV., p. 402, *seq.* and 416, *seq.*

III. CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

1. In proportion as the churches drew into their membership masses of unregenerate, half-pagan people, and accorded church privileges to those baptized in infancy without any profession of conversion, did the difficulty of controlling the churches increase. It was natural that the higher ecclesiastical authorities should provide the local priests with minute directions regarding the punishment to be inflicted upon persons of every condition for offenses of every description. The disciplinary rules drawn up from time to time, before and after the beginning of the present period, gradually assumed a systematized form in the "Penitential Books." Among the earliest books of this kind was that of Columban, the

Iro-Scottish missionary, already referred to. Corporal punishment was prescribed for the slightest infringement of the rules.

One of the most interesting of the Penitential Books is that of Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury (669–690). It prescribes deposition for persistent drunkenness on the part of bishops, thirty days penance for the drunken monk, forty for the drunken presbyter or deacon, fifteen for a drunken layman, allowance being made for undue susceptibility to the influence of intoxicants caused by long abstinence, and for festival occasions. Fornication, incest, and all sorts of unnatural sins are punished with penance extending from forty days to twenty-two years, and even to the end of life. The form of penance was prescribed by the priest, and consisted in some sort of self-denial and deprivation of church privileges, according to the heinousness of the offense. This Penitential Book contains also minute directions regarding the treatment of theft, homicide, heresy, and perjury, deposition from the ministry, bars to ordination, communion, idolatry, etc.

2. *Canon Law.* Long before the union of Church and State, ecclesiastical canons had been drawn up and were in common use. Each great section of Christendom had canons of its own, but the interchange throughout the churches of the Roman Empire was so close that considerable uniformity of practice resulted. The so-called Apostolic Canons were in common use as early as the fourth century. The general councils from Nicæa onward furnished a large amount of canonical material. In the sixth century John the Scholastic made a digest of ecclesiastical law, incorporating the ecclesiastical legislation of Justinian. In the West, near the close of the fifth century, Dionysius Exiguus, a learned monk, made a very full collection, containing not only canons of councils and apostolic canons, but also decretals of popes. Isidore of Seville (seventh century) added to this work from later decretals and other sources.

3. *Means Employed for Enforcing Ecclesiastical Decisions.* The possession of the power of the keys gave to the hierarchy the prerogative of admitting to church privileges or excluding from them. It was believed that out of the church there is no salvation. Hence permanent exclusion from church privileges meant loss of salvation, and temporary exclusion involved more or less peril. Excommunication was one of the most terrible penalties

that could be inflicted. When accompanied, as was often the case, with anathema, its terror was intensified. The use of the interdict, involving the prohibition of religious services (including marriage and burial, but not baptism and extreme unction) in an entire community, was frequently resorted to in order to enforce ecclesiastical decrees on an unwilling community, or to punish offenses in which a large part of the community was implicated. These penalties were inflicted far more commonly and effectively in the succeeding period: but they were the recognized weapons of the hierarchy long before the close of the present period.

IV. MOHAMMEDANISM AS A RIVAL OF CHRISTIANITY.

Just as Christianity was mastering the barbarian peoples and preparing the way for a politico-ecclesiastical organization that should cover and control Europe, there arose in the East a politico-religious organism that was within a few years to expand to immense proportions, greatly narrow the boundaries of Eastern Christendom, erect an effectual barrier against any further Christian aggression in the East, and dispute with Christianity the possession of Europe itself.

1. *Rise of Mohammedanism.* Arabia was inhabited by star-worshiping Semites, with an intermingling of half-heathen Jews and Christians. It appears that the Arabs of the sixth century generally recognized Abraham as their father, although they were hostile to their Jewish and Christian neighbors. Mecca was their sacred city and the Kaaba (a small temple containing the Black Stone) their chief sanctuary. They had the characteristics of the modern Arab, and were admirably fitted to become the followers of a religious fanatic in a career of conquest. Mohammed (born *c.* 570, of a young widow), epileptic in childhood, brought up without education by relatives, came into close touch with Christianity and Judaism during a commercial journey to Syria with an uncle. He was employed during his early manhood in caravans and as a shepherd. When twenty-five years of age he married a rich widow, Chadijah, who was ready to believe in his visions and to forward his plans for founding a new religion. During the fifteen years that intervened between

his marriage and his definite entrance on a prophet's career he was subject to frequent attacks of epilepsy, which he at first attributed to demoniacal possession, but afterward to divine agency. He became filled with enthusiasm for monotheism and hatred of idolatry, and in 610 professed to have been commanded by God through the angel Gabriel to "cry in the name of the Lord."

After struggling for some time against his convictions, he entered upon his career. His first three years were devoted to the conversion of family and friends. Next he preached to the pilgrims resorting to Mecca, denouncing idolatry and incurring considerable persecution. In 622 he was forced to fly from the wrath of the pagan Arabs to Medina (the *Hegira*), where multitudes accepted him as prophet and lawgiver. By 624 he had resolved to subdue the world to his monotheistic faith and with an army of three hundred and five enthusiasts he defeated double the number of pagan Arabs. His motto soon became "Islam, tribute, or the sword." No quarter was to be given to persistent infidels, but Christians and Jews were in many cases tolerated on their consenting to pay tribute. Those who submitted were usually inspired with his enthusiasm and were ready to take up the sword for Islam. Jewish and Christian communities were attacked and six hundred resisting Jews were massacred in a single day, the women and children being enslaved.

In 630 he entered Mecca with a considerable army, destroyed the three hundred and sixty idols in the Kaaba, and secured recognition as the leader of the Arabs. The discordant and unorganized tribes of Arabia were thus welded into a nation and filled with enthusiasm for the destruction of idolatry and for universal conquest.

During these twenty years Mohammed had professed to be receiving revelations from time to time, which he dictated to his followers and which became the Koran. He died in 632 as he was planning a great campaign against the Eastern empire.

2. *Principles of Mohammedanism.* These are fully embodied in the Koran and exemplified in the history of Mohammedan conquest, rule, and life. (1) *Monotheism* occupies the foremost place. The oneness and soleness

of God are in the Koran continually asserted. "There is no god but Allah, and Mohammed is his prophet." This abstract monotheism was maintained in opposition not only to polytheism but also to Christian trinitarianism. God is thought of as omnipotent and omniscient, as a despotic ruler mercilessly smiting down his opponents, and as fate compelling all things to fulfill his will; but his love and his fatherhood are practically ignored, and no provision for the redemption of mankind appears.

(2) *Jesus* is recognized as Messiah and prophet, but his deity is repudiated as involving blasphemy. His supernatural birth and his miracles are admitted. He was not crucified in reality, but taken up by God into Paradise. Mohammed claimed to be the Paraclete promised by Jesus.

(3) *Ethics*. Resignation to the will of God is the chief virtue. Prayer, fasting, almsgiving, abstinence from pork and wine (and, of course, alcoholic drinks of every kind), are insisted upon. Polygamy and concubinage were practised by Mohammed and are encouraged. Slavery is approved and practised. War to the death against unbelievers is a sacred duty. Those who die in fighting for the faith are supposed to enter at once upon a glorious existence in which sensual delights abound. No system has ever made men more enthusiastic or readier to lay down their lives for its promotion. No system, it is probable, hardens men more effectually against the influence of the gospel of Christ.

3. *Achievements of Mohammedanism before the Close of this Period*. The successors of Mohammed entered at once upon the world-conquest that he died too soon to accomplish. Palestine, Syria, and Egypt were speedily overrun, and thousands of Christian churches destroyed or turned into mosques. Constantinople narrowly escaped falling into their hands (668 and 717) The Eastern empire had become so weakened by internal corruption, barbarian invasion on the west and Persian attacks on the east, and by long-continued religious controversy, that it was unable to cope with so vigorous and determined a foe. Persecuted Christian parties were in many cases willing to aid the Saracens against their Christian oppressors. Toleration was granted to such Christians

and Jews as would recognize their sovereignty and pay tribute. In 707 Northern Africa fell into their hands. Four years later they occupied the southern portion of Spain and established the califate of Cordova, subjugating the Visigoths. In 732 they crossed the Pyrenees and threatened to overthrow the Frankish kingdom and to use St. Peter's in Rome as a stable for their horses. Their ambition was boundless and they believed that no power on earth could stay their progress. They were defeated by Charles Martel and their conquest in the West was brought for centuries to a period.

In the East they overran Persia, Afghanistan, and part of India, and soon brought to the front as enthusiastic fighters for Islam, the Turks, who have since figured so prominently in political and religious history.

For an admirable account of Mohammedanism in its relation to Christianity and a full bibliography, see Schaff, Vol. IV., pp. 143–201. The best translation of the Koran with introduction, etc., is that by Palmer, in "Sacred Books of the East." See also Muir, "The Corân: Its Composition and Teaching; and the Testimony it bears to the Holy Scriptures," third ed., 1878; Sprenger, "*Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammad*"; Bosworth Smith, "Mohammed and Mohammedanism"; Stobart, "Islam and its Founder"; and encyclopedia articles on "Mohammed," "Mohammedanism,' "Islam," etc.

PERIOD IV

FROM THE CORONATION OF CHARLEMAGNE AS EMPEROR OF THE ROMANS TO THE OUTBREAK OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION (800–1517)

CHAPTER I

SOME ASPECTS OF MEDIÆVAL CIVILIZATION

I. PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS

1. *The Constituent Elements of Mediæval Civilization*

Roman [illegible]

CONSIDERABLE progress had already been made by the beginning of the ninth century in the blending of the Christianized Græco-Roman civilization with the modes of thought and life and the social and political institutions of the Teutonic peoples.

Monkish missionaries had been the chief agents in disseminating throughout Teutonic Europe the form of Christianity that had resulted from the conversion of the Roman empire by Christianity in its Græcised form. Teutons had for centuries fought against the Romans and had learned much about the empire and its institutions from this hostile contact. They had afterward filled the Roman armies and had thus come into still more effective contact with this great civilized power. Roman military and administrative posts throughout the conquered territories had also exerted their influence. But more efficient than all was the covering of heathen Europe with monastic mission stations, which not only won the people to a nominal adherence to Christianity and familiarized them with its teachings, but which made them acquainted with the arts and sciences, as they were understood at the time, and transformed heathen hordes into civilized communities.

It was political shrewdness quite as much as religious zeal that led the Frankish kings to bestow so much of wealth and effort on the conversion of the Teutonic peoples and the establishment of a well-endowed and comprehensive hierarchical system throughout their domains. In no other way could they hope to accomplish so much in the direction of welding the peoples into a political unity and securing an efficient, centralized civil administration.

If they were over sanguine as regards the possibility of maintaining a great empire made up of heterogeneous and partially civilized peoples, they at least adopted the most efficient means within their reach to the end in view. Mediæval civilization was essentially the outcome, as suggested, of the blending of Christianized Græco-Roman civilization with Teutonism; but its course was to a considerable extent modified by the Saracen (Arabic) and the Turkish conquests and contact.

2. *The Middle Ages a Period of Progress.*

It is a grave mistake to regard the Middle Ages as a period of stagnation or retrogression. If we compare the best Christian life that we know of in the ante-Nicene age with the corrupt Roman Catholicism of the present period, the latter, of course, appears at a great disadvantage. But when we remember that outside of the hierarchical churches there were throughout the Middle Ages in the East and the West vast numbers of evangelical Christians, and that inside of the established churches even at their most corrupt estate a large number of earnest Christians were to be found, it can hardly be asserted that Christianity, on the whole, lost ground. But the achievements of Christianity during this period appear to still greater advantage if we compare the barbarian Europe of the fifth century with the Christianized and educated Europe of the sixteenth. Christianized Roman law took the place of the law of wager, the ordeal, torture, and the *wergeld*.[1] Life and property became reasonably secure. Industrial development and organization made wonderful strides. Commerce developed to world-wide proportions. Great cities, with magnificent architecture, were built up from the Mediterranean to the Baltic, in England, and throughout the Danubian Valley. Almost every important town had its university and education was becoming widely diffused. There remained much of ecclesiastical corruption and intolerance and much of political and social oppression and injustice, which modern Christianity is gradually eliminating; but the Middle Ages represent the transition period from the earlier barbarism to modern civilization.

---

[1] Money compensation for the maiming or the killing of a person, which was itself an advance on the older law of retaliation.

There was retrogression in the East, caused chiefly by the gradual encroachment of the Saracens and the Turks on the Christianized Græco-Roman civilization of the Eastern empire and the ultimate extinction of the latter.

II. THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE.

LITERATURE: Bryce, "The Holy Roman Empire"; Emerton, "Introd. to the Study of the Middle Ages"; Adams, "Hist. of Civilization dur. the Middle Ages"; Guizot, "Hist. of Civilization"; Hallam, "The Middle Ages"; Greenwood, "*Cathedra Petri*"; Milman, "Lat. Christianity"; Giesebrecht, "*Gesch. d. deutschen Kaiserzeit*"; Hauck, "*Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*"; Stephens, "Hildebrand and his Times"; Balzini, "The Popes and the Hohenstaufen"; Raumer, "*Gesch. d. Hohenstaufen*"; Fisher, "The Mediæval Empire," 1898.

1. *The Idea of the Holy Roman Empire.* The coronation of Charlemagne by the pope, December 25, 800, was a great event from a political no less than from an ecclesiastical point of view. The grandeur of the Roman Empire and the legality and stability for which it stood had made a profound impression on the Teutonic peoples. With the decline and at last the virtual extinction of the authority of the Eastern empire in Italy and the growth of Frankish influence throughout Europe, it was natural that the greatest of the Frankish rulers, having been invited to Italy by the pope again and again to guard the papal estates from the Lombards, and having become the virtual ruler of Italy, should think it worth his while to assume along with his imperial authority the dignity and the name of Roman Emperor. At one time he had strong hopes of extending his dominion over the Eastern empire by marriage, alliance, or conquest.

That he should have been willing to receive his crown at the hands of the pope is easily comprehensible. For a long time the pope had been the chief representative of the old imperial power in Italy. A firm alliance had long existed between Charlemagne's predecessors and himself on the one hand, and the popes on the other, for the mutual advancement of each other's interests. He had become seized with the idea of a Holy Roman Empire, co-ordinate with the Holy Catholic Church, each having world-wide dominion, each advancing the interests of the other, each supreme within its own sphere, and both together bringing peace and the blessings of civilization to all mankind. We have seen how essential he regarded the conversion to Christianity of conquered peoples, and how ready he was to aid in the organization and the endowment of provincial churches.

This idea of a Holy Roman Empire and a Holy Catholic Church was a grand and impressive one and was probably never lost sight of even in times of most complete disintegration.

It should be remarked that while pope and emperor were willing to rule the world conjointly, and each was desirous of the aid of the other, neither was willing to recognize the supremacy of the other, and each was inclined, when occasion offered, to assert his own superiority. Charlemagne's idea of the relation of the pope to the emperor and the emperor to the pope was based upon that of Moses to Aaron. He presided over an ecclesiastical council which legislated in important ecclesiastical as well as in civil matters. He did not hesitate to take strong ground in the matter of image worship against popes and councils. He appointed bishops and abbots with the utmost freedom.

Charlemagne was succeeded by Louis the Pious (814–840), who though far weaker than Charlemagne, and greatly under the influence of the clergy, insisted on recognition of the imperial right to control the church. He claimed a veto power on the appointment of popes, and rebuked Paschal I. for failing to recognize this right. Pope Eugene II. (824–827) compelled the Roman clergy to take the oath of allegiance to the emperor. Louis in turn confirmed the territorial grant and other privileges that the popes had received from his predecessors.

Louis published a constitution in which he defined the relations of the imperial and papal governments. He simply formulated the principles that underlay the policy of Charlemagne, the imperial supremacy being carefully guarded.

2. *The Dismemberment of the Empire.*

The sons of Louis (Lothair, Louis, and Charles) were placed by him in positions of administrative responsibility. They were given the almost independent control of vast territorial possessions. Upon Lothair he bestowed the imperial dignity. He could not satisfy them. They rebelled against him. He was compelled to abdicate, but was afterward restored. He became a mere tool of contending factions. The bishops forced him to do penance in a humiliating way. War broke out shortly after his death.

imp

The Partition of Verdun (843) gave to Charles the Bald Neustria and Aquitania; to Lothair a narrow strip extending from the North Sea to the Mediterranean, to Louis the territory east of the Rhine within the Frankish domain. Lothair retained the title of emperor. His domain was soon divided into three kingdoms, Italy, Burgundy, and Lotharingia (Lorraine). The imperial sceptre passed to Charles the Fat (881) and with him virtually ended the Carlovingian empire (888). The process of disintegration went rapidly forward and Europe was divided into a multitude of petty sovereignties with mutually antagonistic interests and policies.

3. *The Restoration of the Empire by Otho the Great.*

By the middle of the tenth century feudalism had completed its disintegrating work and the former domains of Charlemagne were in a most deplorable condition. Bryce has concisely described the situation as follows:

> The Saracen wasted the Mediterranean coasts and sacked Rome herself. The Dane and Norsemen swept the Atlantic and the North Sea, pierced France and Germany by their rivers, burning, slaying, carrying off into captivity; pouring through the straits of Gibraltar, they fell upon Provence and Italy. By land, while Wends and Czechs and Obotrites threw off the German yoke and threatened the borders, the wild Hungarian bands, pressing in from the steppes of the Caspian, dashed over Germany like the flying spray of a new wave of barbarism, and carried the terror of their battle-axes from the Apennines to the ocean. Under such strokes the already loosened fabric quickly dissolved. . . The grand vision of a universal Christian empire was utterly lost in the isolation, the antagonism, the increasing localization of all powers: it might seem to have been but a passing gleam from an older and better world.

Henry the Fowler, a descendant of Charlemagne (female line), stayed the destructive forces by driving away the Magyars and the Wends and introducing administrative order in Lotharingia. He died just as he was about to seek the imperial crown at the hands of the degenerate papacy. Otho the Great, who succeeded Henry (936), carried forward the work of reconstruction, and by 962 was in a position to restore order in Italy, where anarchy had long prevailed, and to receive the imperial crown from a pope whom he afterward condemned and deposed. His claim to be emperor rested on the fact that he was master of Germany (or a considerable part of it) and that he was in a position to control Italy.

Henry had been only a rough barbarian warrior, immoral, illiterate, without any appreciation of culture or of the proprieties of life; but deliberate and foresighted in political affairs. Otho was a man of marked independence, wearing his beard in disregard of the prevailing usage, and in general careless of conventionalities; but fond of pageantry (as in his coronation at Aix and at Rome) and ambitious to emulate the glories of Charlemagne. It was not so much a care for religion as a desire to bring order into his domains that led him to interest himself in ecclesiastical reforms. He paid far more attention than his predecessors had paid, or were in a position to pay, to the qualifications of bishops and abbots, and insisted strenuously on the right of investiture, the bestowal on the newly appointed bishop of the shepherd's staff as a symbol of his right to rule his flock, accompanied by the bishop's oath of allegiance to the king.

The contest regarding investiture between popes and civil rulers was to be bitterly waged for many years and formed a marked feature of the later history.

Otho and his successors utterly failed to re-establish the empire of Charlemagne. Europe had become hopelessly divided into small political aggregations. France, itself subdivided into many more or less independent provinces, gradually became unified and centralized, and was unalterably opposed to being incorporated in a German empire. Germany itself was hopelessly divided and the rule of a German emperor was of a very limited and uncertain character. Italy was and remained throughout the Middle Ages and until very recent times divided into a number of principalities that stubbornly resisted all efforts at amalgamation.

The imperial office, which for a time was virtually hereditary, was nominally elective; and in case a proper hereditary successor were not available or another appeared who was prepared to enforce his claim to leadership, actual election frequently occurred. An emperor commonly procured the election of his eldest son during his own lifetime. By the middle of the twelfth century there seems to have been a distinct body of imperial electors, consisting of the archbishops of Maintz, Treves, and Cologne, representing the German ecclesiastical estate, and the dukes of Franconia, Swabia, Saxony, and Bavaria. The Golden Bull (1356) redistributed somewhat the electoral franchises and regulated definitely the electoral process. The ecclesiastical electors remained the same. The secular electors were thenceforth the Count of the Palatinate, the King of Bohemia, the Duke of Saxony, and the Margrave of Bradenburg.

like m

Contem

The Holy Roman Empire is of interest to the church historian chiefly as the counterpart of the Holy Catholic Church. From the middle of the eleventh century until the middle of the fifteenth century these two powers, that were theoretically the counterpart the one of the other, were for the most part in mortal combat. Emperors deposed popes and procured the election of others in their place. Popes excommunicated emperors and cooperated with rivals in securing changes of dynasty. Each furnished a sort of check upon the other and it is probable that this contest prevented the triumph of ecclesiastical absolutism on the one hand and of imperial absolutism on the other.

III. FEUDALISM.

LITERATURE: Greenwood, Vol. III., p. 61, *seq.;* Bryce, p. 123, *seq. et passim;* Guizot, "Hist. of Civ." Lect. IV., "Hist of France," Vol. I., p. 227, *seq.;* May, "Democracy in Eur.," Vol. I., pp. 232, 237, 253, 255, 260, *et passim;* Blanqui, "Hist. of Pol. Econ.," p. 116, *seq.*, 155; "Encyc. Brit.," art. "Feudalism"; Hallam, "Mid. Ages," Chap. II.; Hosack, "The Law of Nations," pp. 23, 60, 100, *seq.;* Freeman, "Norm. Conq.," *passim* (see Index); Kitchin, "Hist of France," Vol. I., p. 235, *seq.*, 391, *seq.;* Emerton, "Introd. to the Study of the Middle Ages," p. 236, *seq.;* Adams, "Hist of Civilization during the Middle Ages,"; Waitz, "*Anfänge der Vassalität*," and "*Deutsche Verfassungsgesch.*," *Bd.* II., III., *und* IV., *passim;* De Coulanges, "*Les Origines du Régime Féodal*"; Roth, "*Gesch. d. Beneficialwesens*"; Brunner, "*Die Landverleihungen d. Merovinger u. Karolinger.*"

One of the most characteristic institutions of the early Middle Ages was feudalism. The essence of feudalism "was the combination of the tenure of land by military service with a peculiar personal relation between the landlord and his tenant, whereby the one was bound to render fatherly protection, the other aid and obedience" (Bryce). Politically it might be defined "as the system which made the owner of a piece of land, whether large or small, the sovereign of those who dwelt thereon, an annexation of personal to territorial authority. On this principle were founded and by it are explained feudal law and justice, feudal finance, feudal legislation, each tenant holding toward his lord the position which his own tenants held toward himself. It resulted in a concentration of power in the hands of a land-holding caste. The monarch lost his ancient character as leader and judge of the people, to become the head of a tyrannical oligarchy."[1] Feudal tenure is used in contradistinction to allodial possession, or possession in fee simple. As a result of conquest, etc., tenure of the latter kind almost disappeared, so that under Charlemagne and his sons most of the property fell into the hands of the principal followers and officials of the sovereign.

1. *Feudal Classes and Feudal Terms.*

The five classes of persons in feudal society were Leudes, Antrustions, Freemen, Serfs, and Freedmen.

(1) The first included all who held their possessions directly of the sovereign and constituted the nobility. Personal performance of military service was required of all Leudes, whether lay or ecclesiastical. (2) The second class embraced the noblest and most powerful among the Leudes, including prelates and abbots. To these was entrusted the matter of administration of justice, etc. (3) Freemen included the first two classes, and in addition all who were not serfs and bondsmen.[2] (4) The Serfs were the chattels of their lords and were bound to the soil. (5) Another class, the Freedmen, might be mentioned. They had many of the privileges of Freemen though not all. Both alike, when landless and without handicrafts, were abject and dependent.

---

[1] Bryce, p. 123, *seq.*

[2] Greenwood, Vol. III., p. 82, *seq.*

1. Property
2. Growth

2. *The Elements of Feudalism.*[1]

The forms assumed by feudalism differed greatly at different periods and in different countries. It would be difficult to describe feudalism in general terms in a way that would be universally applicable. The following particulars regarding feudal tenure are characteristic of the system as a whole:

(1) *Terms of Service.* The holding of land upon terms of service (*in beneficium*) applied whether the land was bestowed originally as a fief or was placed by the original owner under the guardianship of a more powerful landowner (*in commendam*).

(2) *Vassalage.* Those receiving land as fiefs or commending land to more powerful owners for protection undertook to serve the feudal lord with their lives. The act by which they became vassals was known as "homage" (from *homo*, man); they became the men of the superior.

privilege

(3) *Immunity.* A person becoming a vassal and the holder of a fief secured in the contract immunity from any kind of interference with the government of the estate beyond what was implied in the vassalage. Apart from the service due to the higher lord he became absolute sovereign within the territory acquired. Bishops and abbots as well as secular nobles received vast grants of land in which absolute sovereignty, apart from the service of the king, was guaranteed. This immunity involved the right to maintain an army, to administer justice, and to raise money at his own pleasure for any purpose whatsoever.

Holders of large fiefs could, by *subinfeudation*, subdivide their territory on precisely similar terms, and these in turn could still further subdivide.

3. *Effects of Feudalism on the Church.*

(1) It retarded the progress of centralization of authority in the papacy by making the prelates Leudes and Antrustions, who did homage to civil rulers for their possessions, and whose interests lay in military and civil duties rather than in ecclesiastical aggrandizement.

---

[1] Compare Emerton, "Introd. to the Study of the Middle Ages," p. 242, *seq.*

Rise of middle man
[illegible] against knights
Came gradually
went

The Roman bishopric itself was for a long time a bone of contention among Italian nobles and lost its prestige by becoming unspeakably degraded and corrupt.

Religious work, even from the Roman Catholic point of view, was greatly neglected, owing to the absorption of higher and lower clergy in secular affairs.

(2) On the other hand, feudalism was on the whole favorable to the final realization of hierarchical power. It put the church in possession of a vast amount of real property which, though given in feudal tenure, could afterward be claimed in fee simple.

At that time tenure of land was the chief means of exerting influence. Apart from the acceptance of fiefs and thus becoming an influential landholder, it is difficult to see how the church could have held its own in those troublous times. As nearly all the education was in the possession of the clergy, their influence on legislation and jurisdiction was very great. The importance of prelates in civil matters, acquired during the early feudal period, could not fail to give a great advantage to the church in later struggles for power.

The humane treatment bestowed upon the serfs and other subordinates by the better class of prelates contrasted strikingly with the cruelty and oppression of most of the lay lords and made service under the former highly desirable.

There is no doubt but that the strong hold which the Roman Catholic Church has always had upon the masses of the people was acquired in part by means of the feudal relation.

As soon as the papacy became somewhat free from the interference of Italian nobles, the claims of prerogative were revived and made still stronger. The influence that had been secured over the masses of the people was of the utmost value. Prelates having gained all the advantages they could hope to secure from the lay lords grew weary of subserviency and sought deliverance through papal aid. As centralization advanced, the popes were able, by utilizing the vast ecclesiastical power already attained, to exert a controlling influence in civil matters, and even to set up and depose kings and emperors.

IV. CANON LAW AND FORGED DECRETALS.

LITERATURE: "*Corpus Juris Canonici*"; Greenwood, Vol. III., pp. 152–226; Lea, "Stud. in Ch. Hist.," pp. 44–102; Hallam, Chap. VII.; encyc. articles; Alzog, Sec. 186: Janus (Döllinger), "The Pope and the Council," pp. 78–122; Savigny, "*Gesch. d. röm. Rechts im Mittelalter*"; Hinschius, "*Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianæ et Capitula Angilramni*"; Schulte, "*Das Kathol. Kirchenrecht*," and "*Die Gesch. d. Quellen u. Litteratur d. Canon. Rechts von Gratian bis auf d. Gegenwart*"; Phillips, "*Kirchenrecht*"; Friedberg, "*Kirchenrecht*"; Hinschius, "*Kirchenrecht*."

Reference has already been made to the rise and early development of canon law. During the present period it assumed an importance second to that of no other institution.

1. *The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals.*

As the Roman Catholic Church grew more ambitious and became more completely involved in secular affairs, the need was felt of stronger documentary support for its claims than could be found. The "Donation of Constantine" is one of the earliest examples of the manufacture of documentary evidence of a valuable kind. The success of this forgery was so complete that it was sure not to be the last. Here again we see the popish doctrine that the end justifies the means, while not formulated, yet consistently acted upon. The weakness and subserviency of Louis the Pious encouraged the hierarchy to promulgate one of the boldest and most magnificent forgeries of history. The "Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals" appeared between 833 and 857. In the former year a body of spurious documents was presented to Pope Gregory IV. as a means of fortifying him in his proceedings against Louis the Pious. To what extent these writings corresponded with the fully developed Pseudo-Isidorian collection is uncertain. On the basis of the older Isidorian collection, a vast body of spurious decretals and patristic citations was foisted upon Christendom. Many older forgeries, the "Donation of Constantine," the "Canons of the Apostles," the "Letters of Clement to James," etc., were incorporated, along with decretals of the popes of the second and third centuries, in which the fully developed claims of the hierarchy are set forth.

The aims of the forgery seem to have been, to free bishops from secular jurisdiction and to give them jurisdiction in secular as well as in ecclesiastical matters; to free bishops from dependence on metropolitans and provincial synods; and to establish for bishops the unlimited right of appeal to Rome, the center and source of ecclesiastical authority. It is probable that the forgeries did not emanate from Rome; but Rome was not slow to utilize them.

2. *Canon Law versus Civil Law.*

Canon law grew more and more influential and important as the papal power and ambition increased. Ecclesiastical courts of every grade corresponding with civil courts and culminating in the Roman Curia, the "Court of Appeal for all Christendom," came into the keenest rivalry with the civil courts. As every crime could also be regarded as a sin, the ecclesiastical courts claimed the right to a large portion of properly civil jurisdiction. The study of canon law became popular and constituted an indispensable qualification for a high ecclesiastical career. A prelate might be a theologian, but he must be a canonist. Canon law was from the beginning one of the principal studies in the mediæval universities. Bologna was the first great center of canon law study and the University of Bologna grew out of a private law school (Roman civil law). About the middle of the twelfth century Gratian, a monk of Bologna, threw into systematic form, after the example of the Justinian codification, the entire body of canonical matter, including the Pseudo-Isidorian forgeries. The "Decretum of Gratian," supplemented by the "Decretum of Gregory IX." (1234), the "*Liber Sextus*," of Boniface VIII. (1298), the "*Clementines*" (1311), the "*Extravagantes*" of John XXII. (1316–34), and the "*Extravagantes Communes*" (1488), make up the "*Corpus Juris Canonici*," corresponding with the "*Corpus Juris Civilis*" of Justinian, which was much studied in the Middle Ages.

The canon law defines in the minutest way the duties and rights of prelates, clergy, monks, nuns, and laymen, fixing the penalties for all transgressions. Much stress is laid upon prohibited degrees in matrimony, relationships falling within the prohibited degrees being carefully indicated. The ages and other qualifications for the various stages of clerical life are definitely fixed. From the dealing of the hierarchy in general and the Roman Curia in particular with transgressions of canon law, it is evident that the authorities in working out this elaborate system were intent not upon guarding priests and people from sin, but upon bringing into the ecclesiastical courts as many cases as possible and deriving as large a revenue and as much power therefrom as they could.

V. THE ROMAN CURIA.

LITERATURE: Bangen, "*D. Röm. Kurie*"; Bonix, "*De Curia Romana*"; De Montault, "*La Sacré College des Cardineaux*"; Phillips, "*Kirchenrecht*," *Bd.* VI., *Seit.* 65–296; Bering, "*Sys. d. Kirchenrechtes*," Sec. 104, *seq.*; art. "*Kurie*" and "*Kardinal*" in Herzog and Wetzer u. Welte; art. "Curia" and "Cardinal" in Schaff-Herzog and McClintock and Strong; art. "Rom. Curia" in "Cont. Rev.," 1874; Alzog, Sec. 194 and 229; Greenwood and Milman, *passim*; Gottlob, "*Aus der Camera Apostolica des XV. Jahrh.*"; Woker, "*Das Kirchliche Finanzwesen der Päpste*"; Hinschius, "*System d. Kathol. Kirchenrechtes für Deutschland*," *Th.* I., *Seit.* 309–498; Lea, "A Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary in the Thirteenth Century" (Latin Text, Translation, and Introduction). See also encyc. art. on "Conclave," "Consistory," "Rota," "Penitentiary," "Pope."

It is important that we should know something of the character and constitution of the papal court that wielded such power over Europe during the Middle Ages. As early as the fourth century the city of Rome was divided for ecclesiastical purposes into twenty-five parts, each presided over by a presbyter. Each of these parishes was called a *titulus*, and the presbyters were called *intitulated* presbyters. For charitable purposes the city was divided into seven parts, each presided over by a deacon. In the eighth century the *suburbican* bishops were added to these presbyters and deacons, and from the eleventh century the body thus formed was known as the college of cardinals. During the later Middle Ages many princes secured the right to nominate each one or more cardinals. These were known as crown cardinals.

The term *cardinal* is derived from *cardo*, a hinge. It was applied in the early time to clergy in general with regular charges. Gradually its use became restricted to the clergy with regular functions in cathedral churches, these churches being regarded as the hinges on which the other churches revolved. In the eleventh century its application was still further limited so as to denote the bishops, presbyters, and deacons of Rome and the States of the Church, who constituted the official advisers or senate of the pope in his administration of ecclesiastical affairs. Pope Leo IX. put the matter thus: "As the whole door is ruled by the hinge, so by Peter and his successors the emolument of the whole church is disposed. . . Whence his clergy are called cardinals, as adhering more closely to that hinge by which other things are moved."

1. *Functions of the College of Cardinals.*

To the clergy of Rome it belonged in the earlier time to nominate the bishop of Rome, the people having the right to vote on the nomination. Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, and even Hildebrand, were elected by popular acclaim. The presbyters and deacons constituted a sort of senate for the bishop in administering the affairs of the diocese. As the ambition and power of the popes increased, the business of the Roman Curia grew in amount and importance. When Rome became the court of appeal for all Christendom and came to sustain the most multiform and complicated relations with all the civil governments, as well as with every bishop and abbot, it became necessary to systematize the work of administration. The college of cardinals assembled for business, with the pope at their head, constitute the Consistory; assembled for the election of a pope they form a Conclave. The Signature of Grace and the Signature of Justice have to do, the former with all cases of binding and loosing, the latter with appeals from Italy. The Penitentiary deals with cases of heresy, indulgences, etc., in a more public way than the Signature of Grace. The Rota is the supreme court of appeal for Christendom. The Datary is a Board of control registering and dating incoming and outgoing communications. During the sixteenth century a number of Congregations were formed, each with a specialty: the Congregations of the Inquisition, of Prohibited Books, of Indulgences, etc. In connection with each of these courts, congregations, etc., a large number of lawyers and clerks are employed. The number of cardinals has varied from thirteen to seventy-six. A majority are always Italians.

2. *Relation of the Curia to Papal Power and Corruption.*

The development of this vast mass of administrative machinery was in a sense a necessary result of the attempt of Rome to secure universal ecclesiastical and civil control. For a time it contributed greatly to the consolidation of papal power; but its maintenance involved vast expenditures of money and greatly promoted ecclesiastical corruption. The presence of this great ecclesiastical machine makes all attempts to reform the Roman Catholic Church from within hopeless. It is not the pope that controls the Roman Catholic Church,—it is the Roman Curia. It is doubtful whether a pope earnestly desirous of reforming the church in its head and members could accomplish anything permanent in that direction.

The Roman Curia was deeply interested, both financially and administratively, in encouraging appeals from all parts of Christendom. It came to be well understood that the disciplinary decisions of metropolitans, abbots, and bishops, could be easily reversed in the Curia, if the aggrieved party could command sufficient money or influence. Bishops appealed against the censure of archbishops or metropolitans, lower clergy appealed against the censure of bishops, wealthy laymen were sure of kindly consideration in Rome. The benignancy of Rome in granting dispensations appears very clearly in the "Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary" published by Lea. Bishops who were disposed to be rigorous in their discipline were helpless. The facility with which any sort of crime was condoned by the Roman Curia had a most demoralizing effect on clergy and people. It became evident that Rome was intent not on enforcing the observance of the canon law or even of ordinary morality, but rather on the collection of fees for their violation. See Lea's excellent account of papal dispensations in the Introduction to the work above referred to.

VI. MEDIÆVAL MONASTICISM.

LITERATURE: Montalambert, "The Monks of the West"; Cutts, "Scenes and Char. of the Mid. Ages," p. 1, *seq.*; Lacroix, "Military and Religious Life in the Mid. Ages"; Helyot, "*Gesch. d. Klöster- und Rittenorden*," 1754; Hospinianus, "*De Monachis*," 1609; Lea, "An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church," second ed., 1884; Möhler, "*Gesch. d. Mönchthums*" (*Schriften*, *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 165, *seq.*); Harnack, "*Das Mönchthum, seine Ideale u. seine Geschichte*"; Hase, "*Handbuch d. Prot. Polemik*," fourth ed., *Seit.* 279, *seq.*; Müller, "*Die Anfänge d. Minoritenordens*"; Knox-Little, "St. Francis of Assisi," 1897; Sabatier, "Life of St. Francis of Assisi"; Heimbucher, "*Die Orden und Congregationen d. Kath. Kirche*," 1896; Danzas, "*Etudes sur le Temps primitifs de l'Ordre de St. Domin.*," 1873–1885; Champly, "*Hist. de l'Abbaye de Clugny*," 1866; Schultze, "*Forschungen zur Gesch. d. Klosterreform in X. Jahrh.*," 1883; Neander, "St. Bernard"; Storrs, "St. Bernard"; Alzog, Sec. 239-251; Stephen, "Essays in Eccl. Biog.," "St. Francis of Assisi"; Hurter, "Innocent III.," Vol. III., p. 427, *seq.*;

Neander, Vol. IV., pp. 239-293; encyc. art. on various orders and monastic leaders.

No institution more faithfully reflects the spirit of mediæval Christianity than monasticism as it appeared in the great monastic orders.

1. *Fundamental Characteristics.*

Monasticism represents the externalizing, legalistic, pagan view of religion as opposed to a spiritual view. It represents asceticism, which nearly all pagan religious systems have exalted. It lays chief stress on obedience to authority. It had completeness of organization. Its votaries were enthusiastic and single minded.

2. *Reasons for the Enormous Development of Monasticism in the Middle Ages.*

(1) The general belief in the meritoriousness of monastic life. (2) The perfect adaptation of the monastic orders for the purposes of the hierarchy and the great encouragement given to them by the popes. (3) The disordered state of Europe, and the prevailing misery led multitudes to seek refuge in the monasteries from the ills of life. (4) Such as had a taste for learning found in the monasteries during the earlier Middle Ages almost the only means of gratifying this taste. (5) Many were brought into the monasteries through the enthusiastic advocacy of great monastic preachers like Benedict, Bernard, Francis, and Dominic. (6) The popes favored monasticism by making the monasteries independent of the bishops, by using monks for responsible positions, by giving to monastic preachers the right to preach, hear confessions, etc., without the permission of bishops or parish clergy, and in many other ways. From the time of Gregory the Great onward it was the aim of the more aggressive popes to bring the entire body of the clergy into a monastic mode of life.

3. *Achievements of the Monastic Orders.*

(1) They absorbed most of the Christian life of the age. (2) The monasteries were the conservatories of

learning. (3) The monks performed almost all the missionary work of the age and were foremost in all kinds of Christian and philanthropical work. (4) They were the great writers, preachers, philosophers, and theologians of the age. (5) They were at the head of the Crusades and the Inquisition. (6) The monasteries, owing to the great popularity of monasticism, acquired immense wealth, which invariably led to grievous corruptions, necessitating the periodic formation of new orders by those who wished to stem the tide of worldliness. (7) To the monasteries we are indebted for such men as Tauler, Staupitz, Luther, and Erasmus. (8) The monastic orders sustained somewhat the same relation to mediæval Christianity as modern denominations sustain to Protestant Christianity. They were characterized each by a peculiar type of life or doctrine. So long as absolute obedience to the Roman Curia was preserved a generous freedom was for the most part accorded them in matters of life and doctrine. Apart from the freedom given to peculiarities of life and doctrine in monastic orders it is probable that a far larger amount of earnest Christian life would have separated itself from the dominant church. Thus monasticism was a means of conserving the unity of the hierarchical church.

4. *Evils of Monasticism.*

(1) From mediæval Catholic sources it is possible to construct a picture of monastic life and work in which heroism, self-sacrifice, industry, zeal for sacred learning, literary activity, missionary enthusiasm, purity and simplicity of life, and every moral and religious virtue abound; and a picture in which idleness, luxury, discontent, nameless vices, ignorance, and utter moral worthlessness are the prominent features. It is abundantly evident from monastic literature that the great majority of the inmates of monasteries represented a very low type of intellectual, moral, and spiritual life. Living was beset with difficulties during the Middle Ages, and multitudes took refuge in monasteries from the hardships and perils of life with no thought but that of living at ease. Many whose lives had been disreputable sought to hide themselves in monasteries from public contempt. Given,

a body of men or women, many of them young and sensually inclined, the great mass devoid of high moral and religious principles, all pledged to celibacy, ministered to by monastic officials and by clergy who in many cases set the example of vicious living and were ready to debauch their charges, freed to a great extent from outside observation and from the jurisdiction of secular courts, and the moral rottenness of mediæval monasteries can be easily accounted for. Add to this the fact that the confessors were instructed to ask questions that presupposed moral vileness in each individual and caused vice to be looked upon as a matter of course, that slight disciplinary penance was supposed to make good the gravest breaches of morality, and especially the fact that many priestly confessors were ready to use their power of absolution for making victims of the weak and the ignorant, and the wonder would be that any should escape the contagion.

(2) Narrowness, bigotry, intolerance, avarice, sectarian zeal, characterize mediæval monasticism at its best estate.

(3) While in the earlier time monastic colonies were a means of diffusing civilization and were thus economically valuable, the enormous expansion of monastic life was economically hurtful. The withdrawal of so large an amount of life from productive activity and the accumulation of wealth for the support of so vast a population could be justified only on the ground that their moral and intellectual activity compensated for the loss to the communities in which they were situated and tended powerfully to make the lives of the remaining population nobler and more productive. It is not probable that the monasteries in most communities were worth to them anything like what they cost.

(4) Again, the choice of monastic rather than domestic life by hundreds of thousands of men and women diminished by so much the number of possible homes and prevented such a growth of productive population as would have been in the interest of the countries of mediæval Europe. Prostitution, illegitimate births, abortion, and infanticide everywhere abounded, largely as a result of monasticism and of clerical celibacy.

5. *Founding and Characteristics of the Various Orders.*

While monasticism had its rise in the East, it had its most remarkable development in the West. The Benedictines established in 529 by Benedict of Nursia, reformed and strengthened in 817 by Benedict of Aniane, had a remarkable revival about the middle of the eleventh century. Clugny, founded in 910, was the great center from the middle of the tenth century onward. By the middle of the twelfth century there were two thousand convents subject to Clugny, mostly in France. The Cistercians (convent of Citeaux) arose about 1098 from a desire on the part of the more zealous of the Benedictines to escape the luxury and corruption of the now wealthy monasteries. Bernard of Clairvaux gave great lustre to the new order during the first half of the twelfth century. The Carmelites were founded in connection with the Crusades on Mount Carmel in 1209, and received full papal recognition in 1224. The Augustinians were formed out of a number of older bodies in 1244. The great preaching orders, the Dominican and the Franciscan, were founded during the early years of the thirteenth century under Innocent III., but failed to receive unconditional papal approval till the time of Honorius III (the former in 1216, the latter in 1223). They arose at a time when heresy was spreading rapidly in France, Italy, and elsewhere, and constituted the most effective agency that the hierarchy employed to crush out dissent. The Franciscans (Minorites) represented the intensely emotional form of ascetical piety and sought to win back to the churches the masses of the people through enthusiastic preaching and through extreme asceticism; the Dominicans represented a more intellectual type of life and work and were forward in theological disputation and in the founding and management of the Inquisition. The three great military orders were founded in connection with the Crusades: the Hospitalers of St. John the Baptist (1092), the Templars (1118), the Teutonic Knights (1190). Many other orders were founded during the Middle Ages, most of which still exist. Most of the orders had related organizations for women, and tertiaries, or outside secular adherents.

VII. THE CRUSADES.

LITERATURE: Cox, "The Crusades"; Guizot, "Hist. of Fr.,' Vol. I., pp. 296–380; Michaud, "Hist. of the Crusades"; Wilken, "*Gesch. d. Kreutzzüge*"; Greenwood (see Chronol. Index); Milman, Vol. IV., pp. 15–67, etc.; Alzog, Sec. 216; Lane-Poole, "Saladin and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem," 1898; Kugler, "*Gesch. d. Kreutzzüge*," 1880 (from Oncken, "*Allgem. Gesch.*," *Bd.* II.); Sybel, "*Gesch. d. ersten Kreutzzüges*"; Hahn, "*Ursachen u. Folgen d. Kreutzzügen*"; Prutz, "*Kulturgesch. d. Kreutzzügen*," 1880; Raumer, "*Gesch. d. Hohenstaufen*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 37–231.

1. *Occasion of the Crusades.*

(1) The long series of religious wars for the rescue of the Holy Land and the holy places from the desecrating possession of the enemies of the cross of Christ occupy a position of great prominence in the history of mediæval civilization. In a sense they represent the reawakening of the spirit of adventure and conquest that had been slumbering during the centuries that followed the somewhat definite settlement of Europe. Feudalism, with its subdivisions of territory and its limitations of the areas of intercourse had greatly hampered and narrowed the lives of the people and when once a great moving cause for breaking over territorial bounds and embarking in world-wide adventure appeared the masses of the people were likely to respond with great enthusiasm. The generally prevailing misery and hopelessness of the impoverished classes made them ready to grasp at any opportunity for social amelioration. The feudal rulers were finding war with their neighbors less and less profitable and the danger of an overwhelming Mohammedan invasion from the East was constantly before them. Besides, the popes were coming to interfere more and more influentially in the political strifes of Christendom and were appropriating to themselves the advantages that came from European wars.

(2) The conversion of the Normans to the Catholic faith (911) was an event of primary importance in the civil and ecclesiastical history of Europe. The rapid extension of the Norman conquests until they possessed not only a large part of France, but also England (1072) and Southern Italy, and the willingness of Norman princes like William the Conqueror and Robert Guiscard

to recognize the claims of the popes and to co-operate with them in their schemes of aggrandizement, raised up in the Mediterranean a maritime power, which along with those of Pisa and Genoa, was deeply interested in driving the Saracens from the western Mediterranean and in crippling or destroying their power in the East. The rescue of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica (*c.* 1090) from the grasp of Mohammedanism was the achievement of the Normans and increased their appetite for Oriental conquest. The subjugation of the Eastern empire and ultimately of the Saracen powers was an object of their ambition and they were careful to keep to the front as the religious motive for conquest the spread of the Catholic faith and the destruction of all opposing forms of religion. Thus the war with the Saracens was opened long before the first Crusade.

(3) But apart from these more secular considerations, there were forces at work that enable us to account for the even more important religious enthusiasm that lay at the basis of the Crusades. Mediæval Roman Catholicism was a religion of forms and ceremonies, and superstition abounded. The veneration of shrines and relics and the belief in their capacity to work miracles and to confer spiritual benefits was almost universal. From the fifth century onward pilgrimages to the Holy Land and to the Holy Sepulchre had been regarded as the surest way to acquire merit and to atone for the most grievous sins. Pilgrims without purse or scrip often set out on foot to beg their way to Palestine, fortified by the belief that the loss of life in such an enterprise would involve immediate entrance into heavenly bliss. The early Mohammedan rulers had guaranteed to Christians the right to visit the holy places without molestation. The failure of the year 1000 to bring the end of the age, almost universally expected by Christians, greatly stimulated pilgrimages.

(4) The conversion of Hungary (*c.* 997) opened up an overland route to the Holy Land, which also tended to multiply the number of pilgrims.

(5) In 1010 the Sultan Hakem, a mad fanatic, ordered the destruction of the chief Christian sanctuaries in Jerusalem. The conquest of Asia Minor and Syria by the

Spirit of [illegible]

Seljuk Turks (*c.* 1076) greatly increased the hardships of the multitudinous pilgrims. Extortionate tolls, robbery, imprisonment, and acts of sacrilege, greatly exasperated the pious pilgrims, and the story of these atrocities rapidly spread throughout Europe.

(6) Pope Sylvester II. (999) had exhorted Christendom to take measures for the protection of pilgrims and of Christian interests in Jerusalem. Gregory VII. addressed to the Christians of his time letters of exhortation to go to Jerusalem for the sake of the faith and to "defend our Christian brothers."

2. *The Preaching of the First Crusade* (1095).

(1) In 1095 the Greek Emperor Alexius, sorely beset by the Turks, sent ambassadors to the Council of Piacenza to pray for the aid of Western Christendom. Pope Urban II. was profoundly impressed with the opportunity to extend the dominion of his church and to do a highly meritorious work. Peter the Hermit had returned from a pilgrimage and preached a crusade with consuming zeal.

(2) At the Council of Clermont (1095) Urban II. and Peter both appeared and aroused the crusading enthusiasm to the point for immediate action. An extract from the pope's address will best exhibit the spirit of the movement:

> That land in which the light of truth first shone; where the Son of God, in human guise, deigned to walk as man among men; where the Lord taught and suffered, died, and rose again; where the work of man's redemption was consummated,—this land, consecrated by so many holy memories, has passed into the hands of the impious. The temple of God has been profaned, his saints slain, and their bodies cast out upon the plains for the fowls of the air and the beasts of the field to feed upon. The blood of Christians flows like water in and about Jerusalem, and there is none to do the poor service of giving burial to their remains. Strong in our trust in the divine mercy, and by virtue of the authority of Sts. Peter and Paul, of whose fullness we are the depositary, we hereby grant full remission of any canonical penalties whatever to all the faithful of Christ who from motives of devotion alone and not for the procurement of honor or gain shall have gone forth to the aid of God's church at Jerusalem. But whosoever shall have died there in true repentance shall undoubtedly have the remission (*indulgentiam*) of sins and the fruit of eternal reward.

He promised to all who would enlist the plenary remission of all the infinite penalties and penances they had incurred by their past sins, and the immediate protection of Peter, Paul, and the holy church, for their persons and estates, and pronounced an anathema upon any that should molest them.

The multitude rose to their feet and cried out repeatedly: "It is the will of God!" The pope then exhibited the cross and said: "Wear it upon your shoulders and upon your breasts; let it shine upon your arms and upon your standards; it will be to you the surety of victory or the palm of martyrdom; it will unceasingly remind you that Christ died for you, and that it is your duty to die for him." This gave the name to the movement (crusade, from *crux*, cross).

(3) The pope proclaimed a truce of God among the princes of Europe and bade them join in the great effort for the rescue of the Holy Land. So great was the enthusiasm that they were for the most part ready to obey. Insolvent debtors were liberated from their obligations. The prisons of Europe were emptied of all who would join in the Crusade. The truce of God was extended so as to embrace the full protection of the lives and belongings of all crusaders.

(4) About six hundred thousand men, besides women and children, are said to have embarked on the First Crusade. It was a motley and disorganized host. Freed by their plenary indulgence from all moral obligations and compelled to support themselves to a great extent on the populations through which they moved, they carried devastation everywhere. Pestilence and famine rapidly reduced their numbers. Jerusalem was captured in 1099, about forty thousand crusaders having been spared to participate in the glory. Godfrey of Bouillon, the chief leader, was proclaimed king, but he refused to wear the crown of royalty where Christ had worn a crown of thorns.

The success of the crusaders was only partial and temporary.

3. *Later Crusades.*

It will not be practicable in the present work to give the details of the successive efforts of united Europe to destroy the power of the Saracens and the Turks. A few outstanding facts must suffice:

(1) The Second Crusade (1147–1153), of which Bernard of Clairvaux was the chief promoter, is said to have numbered about one million two hundred thousand fighting men. It was a complete failure. Nearly all the host was destroyed. Bernard, when confronted with the failure of his prophecies, attributed the disaster to the guilt of the pilgrims themselves.

(2) The Third Crusade (1190–1193), in which Richard the Lion-hearted and Saladin figure so prominently, accomplished little. Richard himself was taken captive and long held for ransom.

(3) The Fourth Crusade (1196–1197) resulted in a complete defeat and a terrible massacre of crusaders at Jaffa.

generally the 4th

whole

(4) The Fifth Crusade (1201–1204) was under the direction of Innocent III., the most powerful of the popes. It expended its efforts chiefly in gaining control of Constantinople and establishing a Latin empire in the East, with Baldwin of Flanders, at its head. By this means the pope could bring the Eastern Church into obedience. This Latin empire lasted till 1261, when the Greeks regained control. The alienation between the Eastern and the Roman Catholic churches was intensified by this attempt at coercion.

(5) The Sixth Crusade (1216–1229) was rendered fruitless by the lack of harmony between the popes and the Emperor Frederick II., and the disposition of the latter to disregard the interests of the papacy in his treaty-making with the Saracens. Frederick was in no proper sense a crusader, and had regard solely to political and personal considerations.

(6) The Seventh Crusade (1239–1242) was made up of a French and English expedition, in which neither pope nor emperor co-operated fully. It was without important results.

(7) The Eighth Crusade (1248) was led by Louis IX., of France. His army was almost completely destroyed and he was taken prisoner; but he had the satisfaction of visiting Nazareth in sackcloth on a permit issued by the Sultan of Damascus.

[illegible]

(8) The Ninth Crusade (1259–1291) embraces several feeble expeditions. The crusading spirit was almost extinct, and the most desperate efforts to reawaken it proved futile.

(9) Mention should be made of the Children's Crusade (1212), in which thirty thousand French children, led by the boy Stephen, went forth under the enthusiasm of the time, they knew not whither. Multitudes died of exposure and hardship, and several thousands who secured passage to the East were seized by the Arabs and sold into slavery. A similar movement, in which twenty thousand boys and girls were involved, occurred in Germany. About five thousand reached Genoa, where they were detained. Many of these became prosperous citizens.

(10) There were many crusades against heretics in Europe, as against the Albigenses (1208–1249) and against the Hussites (1420–1431). These were accompanied by the indiscriminate massacre of the helpless populations in the regions invaded.

4. *Attitude of the Popes toward the Crusades.*

From the beginning the popes recognized in the Crusades a means of influence and aggrandizement and favored them to the utmost. They sought to impress upon the princes the wickedness of warring among themselves, while infidels were allowed to desecrate the Holy Land and the holy places. They granted plenary indulgence to all who would go. This involved forgiveness of past sins and the forgiveness in advance of any sins they might commit while engaged in crusading, with the assurance of freedom from purgatorial pains. The prisons of Europe were thrown open and the worst criminals were encouraged to join the crusading hosts on the same generous conditions. Thus for two hundred years the popes were at the head of a movement that was thoroughly popular and absorbed the attention of Christendom. As feudalism had added vastly to the territorial possessions of the church, the Crusades confirmed the church in the possession of the territory already acquired and gave an opportunity for acquiring enormous additional wealth. Many an enthusiastic crusader, to make his salvation doubly sure, bequeathed his entire estate to the church in case of his failure to return. Many in starting needed ready money, which the church was prepared to furnish on good security. Thus the church came to possess about one third of the real property of Europe.

5. *Summary of the Results of the Crusades.*

(1) The breaking up of feudalism and the establishment of great nations. Having secured enormous advantages during the periods of turmoil, the church was ready to avail itself fully of the opportunities that awaited it during the period of the consolidation of the States of Europe.

(2) The great increase of the wealth and the power of the papacy. The power of the pope was beyond all comparison greater than that of any civil ruler. The policy of the papacy was consistent, while that of the civil rulers was fluctuating. The princes became accustomed to follow the leadership of popes and obey their orders.

(3) The opening up of commerce. This resulted from the long-continued intercourse between the East and the West and had great influence upon civilization. Manufactures went hand in hand with commerce and the face of Europe was changed. The vast wealth squandered in the Crusades was far more than made good by the revival of trade and manufactures.

(4) The general diffusion of enlightenment. Contact with the learning and the civilization of the East was not without its effect on the crusaders. An intellectual activity such as had not been known before became almost as general and as absorbing as the Crusades themselves had been. The founding of the great universities of the Middle Ages and the revival of learning were indirect results of the Crusades.

(5) The building up of great commercial centers whose interest lay in opposing feudalism and in promoting freedom of thought and action was largely due to the Crusades.

(6) The Crusades tended to fuse Christendom into a homogeneous mass by uniting it in a common cause.

(7) The Crusades proved in the end a means of weakening, as earlier they were the means of strengthening, the papal cause. The popes continued to urge the rulers to engage in crusades long after the spirit of crusading had departed, and thus had the misfortune to advocate an unpopular cause. Moreover, the growth of intelligence, freedom of thought, commercial and manufacturing enterprise, strong national governments, etc., was adverse to papal absolutism.

474

VIII. THE INQUISITION.

LITERATURE: Limborch, "*Liber Sententiarum Inquisitionis Tolosanæ, 1307–1323*," 1692; Llorente, "*Histoire Critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne*," 1817; Gams, "*Die Kirchengesch. von Spanien*," *Bd.* III.; Bernardus Guidonis, "*Practica Inquisitionis Hereticæ Pravitatis*," ed. Douais, 1886; Döllinger, "*Beiträge zur Sektengesch. d. M. A.*," *Bd.* II. (contains many important inquisitorial documents); Fredericq, "*Corpus Documentorum Inquisitionis Hereticæ Pravitatis Neerlandicæ*," 1889, *seq.*; Molinier, "*L'Inquisition dans le midi de la France au XIII. et au XIV. Siècle*," 1881; Hoffmann, "*Gesch. d. Inquisition*," 1878; Lea, "A Hist. of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages," 3 vols., 1888 (by far the best work in any language, being based upon exhaustive research and written with masterly skill).

1. *Rise of the Inquisition.*

(1) The inquisition of heresy was from the early time a function of each bishop, and in a sense, of each parish priest. The theory had long prevailed that out of the church there is no salvation and the toleration of heresy was looked upon as involving the gravest and most culpable neglect of duty. As the organization of the hierarchical church grew more complete, and as doctrine came to be more rigorously defined, it was natural that increasing stress should be laid upon the enforcement of uniformity in doctrine and practice. Aggressive and ambitious popes were sure to insist with even greater rigor upon the diligent inquisition and punishment of heresy on the part of metropolitans, bishops, and civil rulers. When heresy became so widespread and aggressive as to threaten the foundations of ecclesiastical authority, it might have been expected that the Roman Curia and General Councils would adopt measures of universal applicability for its extermination, and as the business of searching out and punishing heresy became

1. [illegible]
2. fetch him out.

great and complicated it might have been expected that an Inquisitor General and a special Board or Congregation would be created in the Curia for its superintendence. Heresy was generally looked upon by churchmen as the greatest possible evil, and the heretic as the enemy of God and men and as worthy of no humane consideration.

(2) The early tradition (confirmed by a bull of Pope Sixtus V.) that Dominic (founder of the Dominican order) was commissioned by Innocent III. to establish the Inquisition, seems not to be in accord with the facts.[1] But that the Dominicans were from the beginning the chief promoters and agents of the Inquisition there can be no doubt.

(3) The Councils of Montpelier and Lateran (1215) both enacted rigorous decrees for compelling bishops to greater diligence in the inquisition of heresy. The Council of Narbonne (1227) made it obligatory upon every bishop to constitute in each parish a special commission for searching out and reporting cases of heresy. Where bishops were suspected of indifference or inefficiency papal legates (usually monks) were sent into their dioceses to assist in the matter, and if necessary to act independently.

(4) The Emperor Frederick II., though a pronounced antagonist of the papacy, joined hands with the popes in the persecution of heresy (1220–1239). Laws were enacted requiring those suspected to purge themselves, deprivation of all civil rights being the penalty. Heresy of every kind was made a criminal offense. Obstinate heretics were condemned to the stake; those that recanted were to be imprisoned for life; those that relapsed were to be executed; the property of heretics was to be confiscated and their heirs disinherited; favorers of heretics were to be banished and their property confiscated; houses of heretics and their friends were to be destroyed and never rebuilt; the lands of civil rulers who should neglect to purge them of heresy were to be open for occupancy by any Catholic who would extirpate heresy therefrom. Frederick was prompt to place at the

---

[1] See Lea, Vol. I., p. 299, *seq.*

disposal of the organized Inquisition all the machinery of the civil government. A more sanguinary code can hardly be conceived.

(5) In 1233 Gregory IX. assigned the prosecution of heresy to the Dominicans and armed them with authority to carry on their work everywhere independently of the bishops. From their decisions there was to be no appeal, and they were authorized to call in the aid of the secular arm. The transition from the earlier episcopal inquisition to the Inquisition as a department of the papal government entrusted to the Dominicans was thus a gradual one. For years permanent tribunals had existed in the south of France (Toulouse, Carcassone, etc.) conducted under the direction of the popes. The papal bulls of 1233 completed the process of supplanting the episcopal inquisition by the papal. Yet the bishops were not wholly relieved of responsibility; but were urged to greater diligence and to hearty co-operation with official inquisitors.

(6) Another stage in the development of the Inquisition is marked by the bull of Innocent IV. ("*Ad Extirpanda*," May, 1252). The aim of this document was to extend the organized inquisition of heresy to every community. All rulers are required to put heretics under the ban. Each magistrate must appoint, on the nomination of the bishop and of representatives of the Dominican and Franciscan orders, twelve good Catholics and several clerical assistants, whose sole business it should be to arrest heretics, seize their goods, and deliver them up for trial to the bishop or his representatives. Their wages and expenses were to be paid by the civil government and by fines and confiscations. They were to be appointed for six months, subject to removal at any time and to reappointment. They were to be exempt from civil duties and from interference by civil authorities. As the commission went from place to place it was to be accompanied by a deputy of the civil ruler who was required to summon three men of good repute and to compel them to give full information regarding heretics within their knowledge. The civil authorities were required to act in entire subserviency to the inquisitors, and to have lists of all heretics made out, to be read three times a

year in public. The local inquisitors were to have a third of the proceeds of confiscations and fines, the cities a third, and the bishops the other third. Officials were required, on pain of excommunication for themselves and interdict for the city, to inscribe these regulations in the statute books. Every ruler was required to appoint three good Catholics, nominated by the ecclesiastical authorities, whose business it should be to prosecute him for any failure to carry out the requirements of the bull and to report on the conduct of his predecessor in office. Revised editions of this bull were issued in 1254, 1255, 1256, 1257, 1259, and 1265.

(7) The completeness with which these requirements were carried out depended upon the subserviency of the civil rulers. In Italy, Spain, and Southern France the Inquisition was established in all of its irresponsibility and terrible rigor. In most parts of Germany it was applied only partially and spasmodically.

(2) The office of Inquisitor General was created by Urban IV. in 1262, one of the cardinals having been up to this time charged with the general superintendency of inquisitorial work.

2. *The Inquisitorial Process.*

(1) The evils of the Inquisition were exaggerated by the fact that the avarice of the ecclesiastical authorities and of informers was greatly stimulated by the practice of confiscating the estates of convicted heretics and of dividing the proceeds between the authorities and the informers. The censure and obloquy resting upon officials of the Inquisition who should fail to convict any one who might afterward be proved guilty was so grave that inquisitors felt bound to use all diligence, and to convict by all means if grave suspicion rested upon the accused. The benefit of the doubt was by no means likely to be given to one who had fallen into the clutches of the Inquisition. As evidence must be found for the conviction of suspected heretics, torture in its most exquisite and varied forms was employed in order to compel confession of personal guilt and betrayal of accomplices. Skilled cross-questioners were employed to use every device for betraying the victims into damaging admissions, and

false promises of favor were often made to secure confession.

(2) Abundant information has been preserved in the handbooks of the Inquisition as to the means employed for eliciting evidence. The facts ascertained in any way with reference to each sect or class of heretics were carefully recorded and placed at the disposal of inquisitors everywhere. The particular methods that had succeeded in given cases were described for the guidance of others. Modes of expression or the avoidance of particular words and phrases were carefully noted. In fact, everything that would occur to a skilled detective was sure to be thought out by one or other of the multitude of able men employed in inquisitorial processes and even if the inquisitors had been scrupulously careful not to condemn the innocent there was little chance that one really guilty should escape. The details of the inquisitorial process, including the accusation, the denunciation, the examination, the application of torture, imprisonment in the dungeons of the Inquisition with all the horrible accessories that human ingenuity could devise, the sentence (with its mocking prayer to the civil authorities for executive clemency), the execution, the confiscation of estates, the branding of the families of condemned heretics with perpetual infamy, cannot be given here.[1]

3. *Effects of the Inquisition.*

(1) It could not have failed to brutalize those who were immediately engaged in the work and all who sympathized therewith. The frequent perpetration in every community of the horrible scenes accompanying the trial and execution of heretics, and the unpitying, often gloating, attitude of inquisitors and spectators, must have exerted a powerfully demoralizing influence. The earlier influence of Christian teaching and life upon barbarian sentiment and custom was humanizing and refining. In the Inquisition all the worst features of pagan cruelty were revived and indefinitely intensified and multiplied. The encouragement given to the gratification of private

---

[1] The reader is referred to Lea's great work for the details of the process and for concrete cases of its application in the different countries of Europe.

malice and avarice must have wrought disastrously to the public sense of righteousness and fair dealing. In general, it appealed to and stimulated the basest passions and propensities of the human soul. It reacted powerfully upon civil law and administration and largely neutralized the humanizing effects that Christianized Roman law had earlier produced. It tended to destroy good neighborliness among the people. Each was under obligation to act as a spy upon the private religious life of the other, and each regarded the other as his possible betrayer.

(2) It powerfully stimulated and intensified dissent from the hierarchy, which could not fail to be regarded as antichristian by those who knew something of the spirit of the gospel. The Inquisition destroyed, it is probable, hundreds of thousands of the most earnest and steadfast representatives of evangelical Christianity. A far larger number in each community were compelled by tortures and despair to deny their faith. It was the experience of inquisitors that such rarely became good Catholics, but continued secretly and sometimes openly to practise and propagate their heresy. It is in accord with the principles of human nature that the sufferings endured would intensify their hatred of the pretended Christianity of which they were the victims. Again, it disseminated the persecuted forms of Christianity throughout Europe. Even the most remote and inaccessible regions became filled with anti-Romanist Christians. It led the various bodies of evangelical Christians to perfect their organization and their methods of secret propagandism. The organized and omnipresent vigilance of the Inquisition had to be met by equal astuteness and resourcefulness on the part of the hunted evangelicals. Europe became covered with a system of secret evangelical agencies that could carry forward Christian work in the very teeth of the Inquisition. The multitudinous trade-guilds and secret societies of various kinds became most efficient agencies for the propagation of anti-Romanist teaching. Along with the growth of evangelical dissent skepticism and infidelity greatly increased by way of revolt against papal atrocity and dogmatism.

(3) It co-operated with other influences in bringing the

papacy into disrepute and effecting the papal captivity and ~~schism ; in causing~~ the revolt of Germany against the papacy (under Louis the Bavarian, 1324 onward), of England (Wycliffite movement, 1360 onward), of Bohemia (Hussite movement, 1410 onward) ; and finally in bringing about the Protestant Revolution of the sixteenth century. The Christian consciousness was outraged by the Inquisition, and was sure to have its revenge.

IX. MEDIÆVAL UNIVERSITIES.

LITERATURE: Denifle, "*Die Entstehung d. Univ. d. Mittelalters*"; Rashdall, "Universities of the Middle Ages," 3 vols.; Budæus, "*Historia Universitatis Paris*," 6 vols., 1665–73; Döllinger, "*Die Universitäten Sonst und Jetzt*"; Brodrick, "A Hist. of the Univ. of Oxford"; Mullinger, "A Hist. of the Univ. of Cambridge"; art. "Universities" in "Encyc. Brit."; Lacroix, "Sc. and Lit. in the Mid. Ages," pp. 1–40.

The impulse given to education by Charlemagne was never entirely lost. The Palatine school in which Alcuin taught and in which Charlemagne and his court learned was not a university, but was a precursor of universities. In the schools of Charlemagne and his successors were taught the *trivium* (grammar, logic, and rhetoric) and the *quadrivium* (music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy). During the early Middle Ages teaching was almost confined to the monasteries. The intellectual activity awakened by the Crusades began to manifest itself everywhere during the twelfth century. Eagerness for knowledge may be said to have been epidemic during the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries.

1. *Origin of Universities.*

We may distinguish two classes of universities: those that were developed out of monastic or cathedral schools, as Paris, Oxford, etc., and those that grew up around some great teacher, or were founded by States or municipalities. The great importance that came to be attached to civil and canon law during the eleventh and twelfth centuries created a demand for teaching in these branches of study. There appeared in Bologna about 1100 a celebrated teacher of Roman law, Irnerius by name. His reputation soon extended over Europe and students flocked to Bologna from all quarters. His more advanced pupils were naturally drawn into the work of teaching to meet the ever-growing demand. It was not long before instruction in civil law was supplemented by faculties of canon law, theology, etc. Emperors and popes vied with each other in extending protection and more material favors to the institution. The university idea once having taken hold upon the public mind it became the ambition of every province and of every great city to have one. The earliest of the universities were Bologna (1158), Paris (1200 or earlier), Montpelier (about 1180), Oxford (about 1200), Salerno (before 1200). During the thirteenth century eight new universities were founded, during the fourteenth century about twenty, during the fifteenth about twenty more, and two were founded at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Many of these universities numbered their students by thousands, some by tens of thousands.

The term "university" was not universally or exclusively applied to higher institutions of learning. *Universitas* means primarily a *corporation*, and was applied in the Middle Ages to civil corporations, etc. Among the terms commonly applied in mediæval documents to higher educational institutions are *studium generale*, *studium commune*, *studium universale*, *generalis disciplina*, as well as *universitas* and *universitas studii*. The term *universitas* seems never to have meant, in mediæval usage, an institution where all branches of learning were taught.[1] It was sometimes applied to a single faculty of an institution of higher learning.

2. *Internal Organization of Mediæval Universities.*

At first there was little or no organization. Those who could teach taught, the more advanced scholars assisting the teachers proper. There were no fixed rules of government, each case of discipline being disposed of on its own merits. But the concourse of thousands of men and youths of various nationalities and degrees of culture soon made it absolutely necessary to develop a complete organization. Relations between students and teachers, between students and teachers of one nation and those of another, and between university and city or province, had to be definitely determined. Regular forms of promotion to the teacher's office and to various academic degrees must be prescribed, etc.

---

[1] Denifle, *Seit.* 32, *seq.*

(1) *Relations between Students and Masters*. Two classes of universities may here be indicated: Universities of scholars and universities of masters. The Italian universities grew up for the most part out of law and medical schools and in the midst of republican forms of government and republican sentiment. These were accordingly universities of scholars. In these the appointment of officers and the government of the entire body was in the hands of students and teachers alike. At the beginning most of the students were doubtless mature and earnest and little risk was involved. The University of Paris and the universities modeled after it, were universities of masters. This is to be accounted for by the fact that it was developed out of a monastic or cathedral school in which rigorous discipline had been practised and the old relation was sustained in the new order of things. The work of masters or doctors was three-fold: lecturing, repeating, and disputing.

(2) *Division into Nations*. All the nations together elected a rector, who held his position for a stated time and who stood at the head of university administration. Each nation elected a procurator, or counselor, to represent it in general university affairs and to preside in all matters affecting the internal interests of the nation. The procurators constituted a sort of senate for the rector.

The "nations" in the various universities did not strictly follow national lines. The masters and students of several nations were often grouped in one "nation," and those belonging to the same nationality were sometimes subdivided into several "nations." In the University of Paris the nations were France, England, Normandy, and Picardy. All but England were virtually French, and England embraced not only Great Britain but nearly the whole of Northern and Eastern Europe. The intention was to give to Frenchmen a preponderance in the government of the institution. The "English nation" became the "German nation" in 1437 because of hostility between France and England.

(3) *Privileges and Immunities of Universities*. Universities usually sought and obtained the right of self-government, involving immunity from municipal interference. Misconduct of students often led to serious conflicts with

the police, and jeopardized the right of self-government. Threats to remove the university to another town usually brought the municipal authorities to terms and the "boycott" was very freely and persistently employed as a means of punishing obnoxious inn-keepers and shopkeepers. The university authorities dictated the price of lodgings, provisions, writing materials, manuscript books, etc.

"Sorbonne"

3. *The University of Paris.*

We may illustrate the constitution and work of a mediæval university by giving some particulars regarding the University of Paris, the greatest and most influential of them all. The faculty of arts embraced the *trivium* and the *quadrivium*. College H.S. There were faculties of theology, canon law, civil law, and medicine.[1] The faculty of arts had four proctors, one for each nation. The faculty of theology, besides its dean, appointed each year a syndic to manage its business. The other faculties had each a dean. The proctors and deans, with the rector, who was nominated by the proctors and who must belong to the arts faculty, constituted the highest tribunal of the university. The rector while in office had almost absolute power.

The University of Paris was fostered by popes and kings alike. The Sorbonne, or theological faculty (founded by Robert Sorbon in 1250), came to be the highest theological authority in the world, not excepting that of the popes themselves, with whom it was frequently in collision.

The glories of the University of Paris are eloquently set forth by Lacroix:

> If Bologna might boast her civil lawyers, Salerno her physicians, Paris might vie with these great schools in their peculiar studies, and in herself concentered the fame of all, especially of the highest—theology. The university of Paris had its inviolable privileges, its own endowments, government, laws, magistrates, jurisdiction; it was a State within a State, a city within a city, a church within a church. It refused to admit within its walls the sergeant of the

---

[1] According to an early account canon and civil law were at one time grouped together and "rational, natural, and moral philosophy" formed the fourth. This fourfold division of what is called the "fountain of wisdom" is compared, in a "letter of the university of masters and scholars studying at Paris," 1254, to the four rivers of paradise. (See Denifle, *Sett.* 67, *seq.*)

mayor of Paris, the apparitors of the bishop of Paris; it opened its gates sullenly and reluctantly to the king's officers.

4. *Contents of the Courses of Instruction.*

The necessity of dictating both the text and the elucidation greatly limited the ground that could be covered in any department.

(1) In theology the Bible and the "Four Books of Sentences," by Peter Lombard, were the customary textbooks. Six years were normally spent in biblical study. This completed, the student became a "sententiary," and began to study Peter Lombard. With the completion of the third book he became a "formed bachelor." After the completion of the fourth book he must remain for three years in the university to exercise himself in disputing and preaching before he could become a "master" in theology. This course presupposes the arts degree or its equivalent. (2) In canon and civil law the "Decretum of Gratian," the "Theodosian Code," and the Justinian books comprised the texts. (3) In medicine, Avicenna (an Arabian author), Hippocrates, and Galen were the chief texts. (4) In arts Aristotle, Porphyry, and Priscian were most frequently used. (5) The masters sometimes compiled summaries of the authors studied, which practically took the place of the full texts. Readers were in many cases employed to dictate texts. (6) Besides the texts and the lectures by the masters disputations were frequently held between masters and students for the benefit of the latter. Masters also held public disputations among themselves which did much toward devoloping the dialectic spirit. The *quodlibetarian* disputations, in which masters offered to discuss any subject that might be mooted with any one who might present himself, always awakened great interest as occasions on which brilliant men could distinguish themselves for learning and dialectic skill. (7) From this brief account it will be evident that there was in the mediæval universities no such thing as research. The inductive method had not yet been introduced, and the methods of discovering truth were not yet available. There was abundance of zeal for learning, but it was not according to understanding, and the universities did little

beyond conserving the learning of the older time, perfecting the scholastic philosophy and theology, sharpening the intellect by excessive application to dialectics, and making skilled sophists. Most of the independent thinking of the age was outside of university circles.

X. MEDIÆVAL THEOLOGY.

LITERATURE: Pertinent sections in the histories of Philosophy, by Ueberweg, Erdmann, Ritter, Windelband, and Weber; Maurice, "Mor. and Metaph. Philosophy," Vol. I., p. 432, *seq.*, Vol. II., p. 1, *seq.*; works of the leading mediæval theologians (Roscellinus, Scotus Erigena, Abelard, Peter Lombard, Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura, Occam, etc.); Hampden, "Bampton Lectures"; Lacroix, "Science and Literature of the Middle Ages," pp. 41–76; works on the history of doctrine, by Harnack, Loofs, Seeberg, Baur, Fisher, Sheldon, etc.; Werner, "*Die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters*"; Rousselot, "*Etudes sur la Phil. dans le Moyen-Age*"; Harper, "The Metaphysics of the Schools"; Löwe, "*Der Kampf zwischen dem Realismus und Nominalismus im Mittelalter*"; Nitzsch, "*Die Ursachen des Umschwungs und Aufschwungs der Scholastik im XIII. Jahrh.*"; Reuter, "*Gesch. d. rel. Aufklärung im M. A.*"; encyclopedia articles on "Scholasticism" and the leading scholastics.

The beginning of the present period found theological science in a degenerate and moribund condition. The achievements of the preceding periods were not even being properly conserved, and advance was out of the question. The impulse given by Charlemagne to the revival of learning was never wholly lost in the time of feudalistic disintegration and demoralization; and the age of the Crusades, as has already been pointed out, brought with it a reawakening of interest in theological science. Only a brief outline of the history of mediæval theological thought is here practicable. The doctrinal controversies of the period are relatively unimportant.

[illegible]

1. *Incipient Scholasticism.*

The term scholasticism (or the teachings of the schools) has long been used to designate the formal theologizing conducted according to the categories of the Aristotelian philosophy and with the use of the deductive method, that prevailed during the Middle Ages and later.

Scholasticism was philosophy in the service of established and accepted theological doctrines, or, at least, in such subordination to

Know imp. of some men

[illegible]
[illegible] the mediaeval kind of mind [illegible]
from [illegible]

them, that where philosophy and theology trod on common ground, the latter was received as the absolute norm and criterion of truth. More particularly, scholasticism was the reproduction of ancient philosophy under the control of ecclesiastical doctrine, with an accommodation in cases of discrepancy between them, of the former to the latter.[1]

(1) The first great representative of the methods of thought and of discussion that afterward was developed into full-fledged scholasticism was *John Scotus Erigena* (b. 800–810), probably an Irishman by birth and education, who was invited (843) by Charles the Bald to the headship of the palatine school at Paris, which the king sustained after the example of Charlemagne. He was employed by the king to translate into Latin the Pseudo-Dionysian (Christian Neo-Platonic) writings, with the spirit of which he became deeply imbued. He was somewhat acquainted with the writings of Plato and of Aristotle. A very imperfect translation of some of Aristotle's dialectical works by Boëthius (d. 525), a Roman statesman and philosopher, had long been in use in Christian education and had before this time produced a marked impression on theological thought. As a Christian Neo-Platonist, Scotus Erigena opposed the Aristotelian theologians, whom he called "dialecticians."

The most noteworthy features of his system were the following: *a*. He set the example to later scholastic theologians of placing the "Fathers" on the same level of authority as the Scriptures. It is not for us to pass judgment on the wisdom of the Fathers, but piously and reverently to accept their teachings. Where they seem to contradict each other we are at liberty to choose what seems to us more in accord with the divine oracles.

b. With Augustine, he insisted on the identity of true philosophy and true religion. He refused to identify true religion with the current orthodoxy. "Authority proceeds from true reason, but true reason by no means proceeds from authority. All authority that is not approved by true reason seems to be weak."[2] He was thus fundamentally a rationalist and so far fell short of fully developed scholasticism.

---

[1] Ueberweg, "Hist. of Phil.," Vol. I., p. 355.
[2] "*De Divisione Naturæ*," Vol. I., pp. 39, 71.

[illegible]

c. With Pseudo-Dionysius he insisted that God alone "essentially subsists," that he alone "truly is," that he is "the essence of all things," and that he is "the beginning, middle, and end of all things." Our life is God's life, it is "the Holy Trinity in us" that "loves, sees, moves." His doctrine of the Trinity was deeply tinged with Neo-Platonism.

d. His doctrine of universals laid the basis for the later realism. He held that universals are before and also in the individual objects; but he did not develop his realistic teaching. As a Neo-Platonist he could not consistently have held to nominalism, the doctrine in accordance with which universals are mere abstractions formed in the mind by a contemplation of individual objects. Universals rather are the divine ideas, which alone are realities and of which individual objects are the non-substantial copies. The Platonic realism, in accordance with which universals exist apart from and before the individuals, was tempered in Scotus Erigena's scheme by the Aristotelian view that universals exist only in the individuals. They exist both before and in the individuals.

e. The influence of Aristotle is everywhere manifest in his methods of discussion.

(2) *Anselm of Canterbury* (1033–1109) represents another important stage in the development of scholasticism. He was a contemporary of Hildebrand and of Peter Damiani and was in thorough sympathy with the aggressive hierarchical strivings of these great prelates. He has been designated, with some propriety, "the father of scholasticism." He is best known for his elaboration of the ontological argument for the existence of God (in his "*Proslogium*") and of the satisfaction theory of the atonement (in his "*Cur Deus Homo?*"). He adopted the Socratic method of argumentation, and most of his writings are free from the formalism and the endless definitions and distinctions of the fully developed scholasticism.

He differed from Scotus Erigena and agreed with the later scholastics in the following particulars: *a*. He insisted on unconditional submission to ecclesiastical authority. "I believe, that I may know," was his favorite maxim, and his creed was the dogma of the church.

Scientific insight the theologian should seek to attain; but reason is to be held in the strictest subordination to creed.

b. While he made considerable use of Platonism and Neo-Platonism, he was not dominated by these modes of thought.

c. He was fundamentally a realist, but his realism was further removed from pantheism than that of Scotus Erigena. His realism appears in his proof of the existence of God, in his doctrine of the Trinity, and in his doctrine of hereditary sin.

(3) *Roscellinus*, a contemporary of Anselm, if not the founder of nominalism, was the first to develop it fully and to advance its positions in a polemical manner. Roscellinus insisted that universals are mere mental abstractions formed from the contemplation of individuals, mere *names*. He applied this theory to the doctrine of the Trinity in such a way as to call down upon himself the censure of Anselm and others and condemnation at the Council of Soissons (1092) for tritheistic heresy. He insisted that just as color is nothing apart from the body in which it inheres, so personality is nothing apart from the person. Assuming the orthodox doctrine of the tri-personality of the Godhead, he maintained that these three persons have each a distinct subsistence, yet are absolutely the same in will and power.

(4) Realism, in a more decided form than that of Anselm, was popularly taught by *William of Champeaux* (1070–1121), who for some years before 1108 was at the head of the cathedral school at Paris and who ended his life as Bishop of Châlons.

(5) *Abelard* (1079–1142) was taught by Roscellinus and William of Champeaux and was one of the greatest thinkers and teachers of his age. Erdmann characterizes him as an "incarnation of French scholasticism with its acuteness and elegance." His romantic love affair with Heloise, a highly gifted young woman for whom he conceived an undying affection, caused much scandal and greatly marred his career. He was accused also of inordinate ambition and of avarice, shown in his relations to William of Champeaux in the Paris cathedral school. He was bitterly assailed for heresy by Bernard of Clair-

vaux and made his peace with the church by abject humiliation and recantation of the errors with which he was charged. He was strongly inclined toward rationalism and was combative in a high degree; but he had not the moral courage of which martyrs are made, and his career was an inglorious one.

The most characteristic features of his theology (or philosophy) are: *a*. His attempt to mediate between the nominalism of Roscellinus and the extreme realism of William of Champeaux. He insisted that universals exist not in words as such (*voces*), but in words employed to express thought (*sermones*). In opposition to William's contention that the universal in its totality dwells in each individual object, he insisted that the universal is that whose nature it is to be predicated of several objects.

Abelard's view is frequently designated conceptualism; but it falls far short of the fully developed conceptualism of the later time. It is doubtful whether Roscellinus would have objected to his maxim that only words conveying thought (*sermones*) are predicable, as contrasted with mere words (*voces*). Most nominalists would have accepted it. Abelard, therefore, may properly be classed with the nominalists, though his language doubtless suggested the conceptualism of the later time.

b. He combated the extreme realistic position that universals have an independent existence before the individuals (Platonic ideas).

c. He was strongly inclined to reject the absolute authority of the church, but did not have the courage to remain steadfast in this position. In his work "Yes and No" ("*Sic et Non*") he arrays the authorities against each other on each matter of discussion, thus exhibiting the worthlessness of human authority. No doubt he was himself a decided skeptic and his methods of discussion greatly promoted skepticism. Bernard had a correct instinct when he was remorselessly pursuing him as an enemy of orthodoxy and of ecclesiastical authority. He insisted on the right and duty of investigation and sought to show that skepticism is a condition of earnest research. Where absolute proof regarding any doctrine cannot be reached, the moral consciousness must be our guide. Peter de Bruys and Arnold of Brescia were his pupils.

Bernard claimed that Abelard "savored of Arius when he spoke of the Trinity, of Pelagius when he spoke of grace, and of Nestorius when he spoke of the person of Christ," and that "while he labored to prove Plato a Christian, he showed himself a heathen."

(6) *Peter Lombard* (d. 1160) wrought the orthodox scholasticism of his time into a convenient handbook ("Four Books of Sentences") which for centuries served as a text-book in many of the universities. The great scholastic theologians made the "Sentences" the basis of their lectures.

2. *Mediæval Arabian Philosophy.*

During the early part of the present period the Christians of Syria developed considerable interest in Greek philosophy and science and made translations of the works of Aristotle, Theophrastus, Themistius, Alexander of Aphrodisias, etc. These Syriac versions were translated into Arabic by Mohammedan scholars. A number of the writings of Plato and the Neo-Platonists were also rendered from the Syriac into the Arabic during the early Middle Ages. On the basis of the Greek philosophy and science, considerably modified by this process of translation and retranslation, there grew up in the East, in North Africa, and in Spain, a remarkable Saracenic culture. "The whole philosophy of the Arabians was only a form of Aristotelianism, tempered more or less with Neo-Platonic conceptions" (Ueberweg).

The most important of the Arabic philosophers as regards their influence on mediæval Christian thought were *Avempace* (d. 1138), *Abubacer* (d. 1185), and *Averroës* (d. 1198).

This vigorous Neo-Platonized Aristotelianism was made available to Christian thinkers in part directly through the sojourn of Christian students among the Arabs, and in part indirectly through the Jewish philosophers, who mastered the Arabic learning and developed a Jewish speculative philosophy of which the Cabbala is one of the most remarkable products, and of which *Avicebron* (d. 1080) and *Moses Maimonides* were the most illustrious representatives.— [illegible] Rel with [illegible] Jewish

To the Arabs and the Jews mediæval Christian theologians were indebted for a remarkable scientific impulse and for a better knowledge of Aristotle, Plato, and the Neo-Platonic writers. For further details reference must be made to the works on the history of philosophy and to monographs on the individual writers and doctrines concerned.

3. *Fully Developed Scholasticism.*

(*1*) *The Fundamental Principle of Scholasticism.*

This was *absolute submission to authority.* Nothing is right or wrong, good or evil in itself. If God should reverse the relations of right and wrong, good and evil, we should be bound to call wrong right and evil good. The church is the final and absolute judge of what the will of God is at any particular time and under any particular circumstances. The teachings of the church must therefore be accepted and defended without regard to the dictates of conscience or reason. The tendency of the entire mediæval system was in the direction of dethroning conscience in the individual and making the will of the hierarchy the conscience of the entire priestly and monastic body, and through this body, of the entire constituency of the church.

(2) *The Material.*

The teachings of the church are to be found in the Bible (including the Old Testament Apocrypha), the decretals of popes, the canons of councils, the writings of the early Fathers, etc. The Bible is authoritative only as it has been authoritatively interpreted by the church, and so ceases to have any independent influence upon thought. The premises for philosophical and theological reasoning are thus unalterably fixed for the individual. There is no inducement to apply the intellect to the searching after truth by scientific methods. To attempt to arrive at the exact teaching of the Scriptures by a study of the original languages and the application of correct exegetical principles would have been regarded as an impertinence, and would have subjected a person to persecution for heresy. For the same reason the history of the growth of opinion had no interest for scholastics.

(3) *The Form.*

The theology and philosophy of the earlier Middle Ages had consisted largely of a concatenation of pertinent passages from Fathers, decretals, etc., in support of each authoritative proposition. Commentaries on the Bible were scarcely more than *catenæ* of exegetical remarks gleaned from earlier writers. Later the dialectics of Aristotle came to be applied and theology assumed a more systematic form. The authority of Aristotle in all matters of formal reasoning came to be regarded as almost absolute. The work of the theological writer was now to draw out, according to the categories of Aristotle, as many conclusions as possible from each authoritative proposition. Little reference was had to the practical value of the conclusions, and theology degenerated into idle hairsplitting, sometimes into gross irreverence.

(4) *Effects of Scholasticism.*

a. It sharpened the logical faculties without furnishing fresh materials for thought. The outward form of theology came to be regarded as of supreme importance, the spirit of Christianity being lost sight of.

b. Scholasticism being a product of papal Christianity and partaking of its spirit, became one of the greatest bulwarks of the papacy and has constituted one of the chief obstacles to the reformation of the Roman Catholic Church.

c. The frivolousness and formalism of mediæval theology brought about reactions which resulted in evangelical revolt, mysticism, humanism, and finally in the Protestant Revolution.

(5) *Leading Representatives of Fully Developed Scholasticism.*

a. Alexander of Hales (d. 1245), surnamed the "Irrefragable Doctor" and the "Monarch of Theologians," was the first scholastic theologian to make full use of Aristotle's works as they were known among the Saracens and of the Arabic commentaries thereon. He became a member of the Franciscan Order and joined with the Franciscans in insisting upon the immaculate conception of Mary. He sought to justify the withholding of the cup from the laity on the ground that the body contains the blood, *i. e.*, that the transubstantiated bread contains both body and blood. He was the first to develop fully the doctrine of the "indelible character" of baptism, confirmation, and ordination. He gave definite form to the distinction between *attrition* and *contrition* (the former indicating sorrow for sin proceeding from fear of punishment, the latter, sorrow for sin proceeding from love to God, in connection with repentance), attrition being considered sufficient. He regarded the pope as "immediately under God," and so as possessing supreme earthly authority. He was a realist of the moderate type, denying that universals are separately subsisting substances before the individuals and maintaining that the universal is in the thing as its form.

b. Bonaventura, the "Seraphic Doctor" (d. 1274), was a Franciscan and was General of the Order (1257 onward). His piety was of a strongly emotional type, like that of the founder of the Order, and his theology perpetuated the ascetical mysticism of Bernard of Clairvaux and Hugo of St. Victor. As a pupil of Alexander of Hales he followed him closely in most doctrinal matters. The influence of Neo-Platonism prevented him from being fully dominated by the newly recovered knowledge of Aristotle, whom on the contrary he frequently censured. He denied the immaculate conception of Mary, holding that the sanctification occurred in her mother's womb. He laid less stress than Alexander, Duns Scotus, or Thomas Aquinas on church authority and upon the mere will of God; but sought rather to find rational grounds for each position taken. Baptism he regarded as not simply working the forgiveness of sins but as communicating supernatural virtues. He interested himself little in the question of universals, contenting himself with the assertion that God is not only the beginning and end of all things, but their archetypal ground as well. He insisted on God's providential care of earthly things, with which he supposed the Aristotelian objection to the immanence of the ideas of things in the divine mind was inconsistent.

c. Albertus Magnus (d. 1280), the "Universal Doctor," mastered the whole of Aristotle as known by the Arabs

[illegible]

and the works of the Arabic commentators more completely than any of his predecessors had done. He was regarded as a marvel of learning and of philosophical insight. More than any of his predecessors he sought to adapt the doctrines of Aristotle to the purposes of the church. He was deeply indebted to the Arabic philosopher Avicenna and to the Jewish Maimonides. He rejected Aristotle's theory of the eternity of the creation, which he did not attempt philosophically to explain, but classed with the miraculous as to be accepted on faith. Universals he regarded as existing before the thing (in the divine mind), in the thing, and after the thing. He sought thus to combine what was true in realism, nominalism, and conceptualism. Like Alexander and Bonaventura he was a Franciscan.

d. Thomas Aquinas, the "Angelic Doctor" (d. 1274), was a pupil of Albertus Magnus, and was the greatest of all the scholastic theologians. His "*Summa Theologiæ*" still occupies the highest rank in the Roman Catholic Church, and the student of mediæval thought can find it here in its most perfect form. More completely than Albert had done, he exploited the works of Aristotle for purposes of Christian theology. He rightly regarded theology as the empress of all the sciences and as using all other sciences for her own purposes. More than other scholastic theologians he uses the Scriptures, but only for the confirmation of ecclesiastical dogma. He represents the principle of absolute subserviency to ecclesiastical authority in its complete form. He was a realist of the moderate type, rejecting as absurd the Platonic doctrine of ideas existing as substantial entities in the divine mind apart from individuals, but holding that everything existed in the divine thought before it came into separate existence. His demonstration of the existence of God, based upon that of Aristotle, is wrought out with great thoroughness. Thomas was a member of the Dominican Order and from this time onward the Dominican theologians were commonly pronounced realists and were called *Thomists* to distinguish them from the nominalistic followers of Duns Scotus, who were designated *Scotists*.

e. John Duns Scotus, the "Subtle Doctor" (d. 1308, aged forty-three or thirty-four, whether Scotch, Irish, or

English is uncertain), was a Franciscan and gained great distinction in the University of Oxford, where several of his works were published. He was removed by the authorities of his Order to Paris to defend the immaculate conception of Mary against the Dominicans, and through the performance of this task and his brilliant lectures in the University of Paris, won the reputation of being the foremost theologian in the world. In the midst of his glorious career he was ordered by his general to take charge of a convent in Cologne. This he did without even taking time to bid adieu to his brethren in Paris and without a murmur. The principle of absolute and unquestioning obedience to his superiors dominated his life.

Even supposing the longer period assigned to his life to be correct, the amount and quality of his literary product is astonishing. He had the work of Albert and of Thomas behind him, and the full fruitage of mediæval Mohammedan and Jewish thought was readily available to him. He accepted unquestioningly the authority of Scripture and that of the church. "Nothing is to be held as of the substance of the faith, except what can be expressly had from Scripture, or has been expressly declared through the church, or evidently follows from something plainly contained in Scripture or plainly determined by the church." He extended considerably the scope of Christian teaching that must be accepted on faith and could not be rationally established. What the church declares heresy must be accepted as such without question. The principle of blind submission to papal authority was never accepted with less reserve. His subtlety was expended almost wholly on efforts to discredit the reasoning by which his predecessors had sought to establish church dogma. Naturally Thomas Aquinas, the great Dominican, was the chief object of his attack. He not only showed the inadequacy of the rational grounds on which the doctrine of the Trinity and other specifically Christian doctrines were based, but also denied that the doctrine of the creation of the world out of nothing and the immortality of the soul could be demonstrated. He attached less importance to Aristotle and more to Plato and the Neo-Platonists than did Thomas. He was a moderate realist, like Thomas, holding that universals are before, in, and after individuals. His universal skepticism regarding the inadequacy of rational proofs for Christian doctrines was far more widely influential during the stormy times that followed his death (Papal Captivity, Papal Schism, Renaissance, etc.) than his insistence on blind submission to authority; and the later nominalism, with its bold skepticism even in relation to church authority, was a legitimate outcome of his teachings.

f. William Occam (d. 1347) was the reviver of nominalism, and to his influence is due the renewed emphasis

[illegible]

that was placed by the Thomists on the defense of realism as a bulwark of orthodoxy. From this time onward scholastic theology was divided into two hostile factions, realists (Thomists) and nominalists (Scotists). Occam went beyond Duns Scotus in his skepticism, denying that any theological doctrines are demonstrable by pure reason. He maintained that universals do not exist in things, but in the thinking mind. Outside of the mind they are only words. Ideas do not exist in God as substantial entities, but only as thoughts or plans. He laid great stress on intuition as a source of knowledge. Occam prepared the way for the application of the inductive method to the study of nature and of mind. He was among the most zealous advocates of ecclesiastical and political reform.

4. *Mediæval Mysticism.*

LITERATURE: Published works of Eckart, Suso, Tauler, Ruysbroek, and Thomas a Kempis; the "German Theology" (English trans.); Preger, "*Gesch. d. deutschen Mystik im M. A.*"; Jundt, "*Histoire du Panthéisme populaire au M. A.*"; Denifle, "*Meister Eckarts Lateinische Schriften und die Grundanschauung seiner Lehre*" (in "*Archiv f. Lit. u. Kirchengesch. d. M. A.*," *Bd.* II., pp. 417–678); Vaughan, "Hours with the Mystics"; Pfeiffer, "*Deutsche Mystiker*"; Schmidt, "*Etudes sur le Mysticisme allemand au XIV. Siècle*"; Schmidt, "*J. Tauler von Strassburg*"; articles on "*Mystik*" and on the various mystics with full bibliography in Herzog-Hauck.

The influence of Neo-Platonism (especially of the Pseudo-Dionysian literature) on the devout thinking of the mediæval times was from the beginning of the period considerable. It gave intensity and fervor to the ascetical piety of Bernard, of Hugo and Richard of St. Victor, of Albertus Magnus, of Bonaventura, and of many other eminent thinkers. The dominance of Aristotelian dialectics, and the degeneration of Christian thinking into hairsplitting subtleties and barren abstractions, could not fail to produce a reaction in the minds of those who cared more about the reality of religious experience than about mere formal statements of truth. The growth of sacramentalism, which attached saving grace to mere outward forms and ceremonies, and which, by making the priesthood the channel through which alone spiritual benefits could be procured, tended to destroy the immediate communion of the soul with God, and failed to satisfy those who felt that direct communion with God is alone efficacious.

In the Dominican Order, which produced a Thomas Aquinas and was the chief agency in establishing and conducting the Inquisition, there arose in Germany toward the close of the thirteenth century that peculiar type of religious thought and life known as Mysticism.

(*1*) *Characteristics of German Mysticism.*

a. One of the most fundamental features of German mysticism was an intense striving in the present life to transcend the human, and to attain to a state of perfect union and communion with God.

b. A fundamental doctrine with the mystics was the absoluteness of God and the nothingness of man. To God alone can being be ascribed. God is above all names. Names given him by men simply indicate his relations. All creatures have their source of life in him. Being capable of self-knowledge and self-revelation, God developed the Trinity out of himself. God as Son, by means of the Spirit, disseminated the divine essence in the visible world. According to its very nature the divine principle seeks to return to its original oneness. This, then, is the ideal of Christian life: to seek absorption into the divine essence. In these conceptions we see the influence of Platonism, especially as developed in the works of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite.

c. Enjoying, as they supposed, perfect and constant communion with God, the mystics claimed to speak from divine inspiration, and exalted their own reveries above the written word.

d. Most of the eminent mystics were Dominican friars. It is remarkable that while in France, Italy, and Spain, the Dominican zeal manifested itself in persecuting heretics, in Germany it expended itself in profound contemplation of the love of God, and in striving after oneness with God.

e. The pantheism that characterized much of the German mysticism, was based upon *realism*. Ideas in the divine mind are *realities*. If God thinks of man he is a man; if he thinks of a stone he is a stone. So man becomes what he contemplates. If he contemplates God he becomes one with God. If he contemplates the sufferings of Christ, he becomes united with Christ in his sufferings.

(2) *Representative Mystics.*

From the large number of able, earnest men that sought, by bringing the people to realize the immanence of God and the immediateness of their relations to him, to deliver them from thraldom to priestcraft and sacramentalism, two of the greatest may be selected for concise treatment.

a. Master Eckart (d. 1327), a German of noble birth, became a Dominican early in life and was probably educated at Cologne. Later (*c.* 1300) he studied in the University of Paris, where he received his Master's degree. He was promoted from one official position in the Order to another until (1310) he was chosen Provincial by the Teutonic Province of the Order. He has been fitly called the "father of German speculation." He was a voluminous writer, producing besides the large body of popular speculative and devotional works, by which he has been chiefly known, a number of scholastic works in Latin that have recently been brought to light. As a scholastic theologian he did not differ materially from the orthodox theologians. A recent writer has declared that "Eckart is before everything else and essentially a scholastic."[1] But "in precision and elegance of representation he falls far behind Thomas." The contrast between scholasticism and mysticism is not so great as has sometimes been supposed. The liberty that the leading scholastics took of discriminating between the things that can be rationally proved and the things that have to be accepted by faith on the authority of the church, gave them much freedom to speculate about transcendental matters, their orthodoxy being saved by their profession of submissiveness in each case to the authority of the church.

Eckart's speculations found expression chiefly in his sermons and other popular discourses. He was an enthusiastic preacher and was earnestly desirous of impressing upon the monks and nuns to whom he ministered his profound thoughts about "the divine nature in its unity and trinity, the relation between God and the creature, especially between God and the human soul, about the nature of the soul, about regeneration and union with God, to which he is constantly recurring."[1]

---

[1] Deutsch, in Herzog-Hauck, third ed., art "Eckart."

(*a*) His view of God was hardly distinguishable from pantheism. His expressions correspond closely with those of Gnostics like Basileides and with extreme Neo-Platonism.

> "All that is in the Godhead is one. Thereof we can say nothing. It is above all names, above all nature. The essence of all creatures is eternally a divine life in Deity. It is God who works, not the Godhead. . . Therein are they distinguished—in working and not working." He was not content with the definition of Pseudo-Dionysius: "God is not," rather he is the negation of negation (*Nichtesnicht*). He applies the expression "unnatured nature" to Deity. The Trinity is the self-revelation of the indistinguishable and indefinable Godhead, or "natured nature." God as Father knows, speaks, generates. His Fatherhood exists only in relation to the Son. The Son is in all things like the Father except in generation. Out of the pleasure and love that Father and Son have in each other proceeds the Holy Spirit.

(*b*) All creatures he regarded in a pantheistic manner as having their existence in God. This is especially the case of the human soul.

> "There is something in the soul which is above the soul, divine, simple, an absolute nothing, rather unnamed than named, unknown than known. . . It is absolute and free from all names and forms, as God is free and absolute in himself. It is higher than knowledge, higher than love, higher than grace. In this power doth blossom and flourish God, with all his Godhead. . . In this power doth the Father bring forth his only begotten Son, as essentially as in himself, and in this light ariseth the Holy Ghost. This spark rejects all creatures, and will have only God, simply as he is in himself. It rests satisfied neither with the Father, nor the Son, nor the Holy Ghost, nor with the three Persons, as far as each exists in its respective attributes. . . This light is satisfied only with the superessential essence. It is bent on entering into the simple ground, the still waste, wherein is no distinction, neither Father, Son, nor Holy Ghost." Again: "God in himself was not God—in the creature only hath he become God."

(*c*) From the above quotations it is evident that he regarded the whole process of revelation and redemption as taking place in each individual. God is conscious only in the creature. Prayer is unnecessary, for we have all truth and all Godhead essentially in ourselves.

---

[1] Deutsch, as before cited.

"God and I are one in knowing. God's essence is his knowing, and God's knowing makes me to know him. Therefore is his knowing my knowing. . . Mine eye and the eye of God are one eye, one vision, one knowledge, and one love."

The birth of the Son takes place in each soul that submits itself to divine influence as it occurred in Jesus. Historical Christianity with its revelation and its redemption sinks into insignificance in comparison with the individual experience of union and communion with the infinite source of being. The incarnation he regarded as the result of the striving of all creatures since the fall to produce a man who should restore harmony. In the creation of the first man Christ was the object. The earthly life of Christ is valuable as an example.

(*d*) Sin consists in directing the will toward the finite and taking pleasure therein. Salvation consists in attaining to a consciousness of our unity with God and in having the Son begotten in us. Absorption in Deity involves the purging away of all sensuous and creaturely affections and the attainment of perfect Christlikeness.

b. John Tauler (d. 1361), a Dominican and a pupil of Eckart, early became a preacher of great power. In mid-career he came under the influence of a "Friend of God," whose identity will probably ever remain shrouded in the deepest mystery, and had a profound religious experience which he regarded as conversion (1350 onward). After years of meditation and study he resumed his preaching in Strasburg, where he attracted great audiences, whom he marvelously impressed with his impassioned eloquence. He was one of the foremost preachers of the mediæval time and by his sermons and writings did more, it is probable, than any other man for the diffusion of evangelical mysticism and the promotion of spiritual Christianity.

It must suffice at present to say that he avoided to a great extent the pantheistic extravagance of Eckart, while yet insisting on the completeness of the union of the believer with God and the directness of the inner experience of divine truth.

c. Among the other more influential mystics may be mentioned *Henry Suso* (*d.* 1365), who was also an eloquent Dominican preacher and who almost equaled Eckart in the extravagance of his pantheistic expressions; *John Ruysbroek* (d. 1381), the chief of the Dutch mystics and almost as evangelical as Tauler; *Rulmann Merswin* (d. 1382), a Strasburg merchant who founded (1366) a religious house for the "Friends of God," or the evangelical mystics, who sought by a semi-monastic organization to carry forward their evangelical preaching and educational work; the author of the anonymous "German Theology," whose influence on Luther and others will be noticed hereafter; and *Thomas a Kempis* (d. 1471), author of the "Imitation of Christ," which has held its place as one of the great devotional works of the ages.

(3) *Influence of Mysticism upon Christian Life and Thought.*

The writings and sermons of the German mystics made a powerful impression upon the minds of a large number of Christians. Comparatively few were led to the extreme of mystical contemplation at which the leaders arrived. But a strong current of earnest Christian life, as opposed to the outward, formal Christianity that prevailed, proceeded from these men, and was perpetuated by their writings. It was not an altogether wholesome mode of viewing Christianity. Yet it was very effective in its opposition to the dead formalism into which Christianity had sunk. Luther, Carlstadt, Münzer, Denck, Schwenckfeldt, and many other leading men in the Reformation time, acknowledged or manifested their deep indebtedness to the mystics, and by these their theological views were in a great measure determined.

XI. THE RENAISSANCE.

LITERATURE: Pater, "Studies in the Hist. of the Renaissance"; Symonds, "The Renaissance in Italy"; Roscoe, "Life of Lorenzo de' Medici," and "Life of Leo X."; Reumont, "Lorenzo de' Medici"; Hallam, "Int. to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries," Chap. I. and II.; Berington, "Lit. Hist. of the Middle Ages"; Gregorovius, "*Gesch. d. Stadt Rom*," *Bd.* VII. (also Eng. trans.); Burckhardt, "*Kultur d. Renaissance*"; Voigt, "*Humanismus*"; Creighton, "Hist. of the Papacy," Vol. III. and IV.; Villari, "Savonarola"; Schaff, "The Renaissance"; George Eliot, "Romola" (a historical novel of great power and value); and Ranke, "Hist. of the Popes." See also encyclopedia articles on the leading humanists.

1. *Preliminary Observations.*

One of the most remarkable phenomena of the latter part of the Middle Ages was the revival of learning. The decline of the Roman Empire witnessed a corresponding decline in literary production. The barbarian invasions swept away, for the most part, the culture that remained. Charlemagne took energetic measures for the revival of learning, and gave a great stimulus to theological studies.

From the time of Charlemagne there was considerable literary activity in the monasteries, but this was for the most part misdirected. Under the influence of dead formalism in general, and of Aristotelian philosophy and dialectics, which gave shape to the theological and philosophical productions of the Middle Ages, theology and philosophy degenerated into endless and aimless hair-splitting. Deductive, rather than inductive in its methods, mediæval theology consisted in the drawing out from a single proposition recognized as authoritative (a text of Scripture, or an expression of a pope, council, or early theologian), of as many conclusions, positive and negative, as possible. From each of these conclusions, arrived at by logical processes, in like manner an almost infinite number of other conclusions were drawn.

Thus resting entirely upon ecclesiastical authority, there was little effort or inclination among the mediæval theologians to arrive at new views of truth. The church had determined how Scripture was to be interpreted, and the Latin text of the Bible was regarded as infallibly correct. There was, therefore, no reason why mediæval theologians should attempt to find out the true meaning of the Scriptures by a study of their original languages, and of the historical relations of their different parts. Mediæval theology thus furnished one of the strongest barriers to the progress of true enlightenment.

While the Saracen occupancy of Spain was regarded by Christians as a great evil, Christians received from the Saracens more of enlightenment during the Middle Ages than from any other source. The influence of Arabic learning upon Christian thought that had already become manifest, was still more marked during the period of the Crusades, and especially in the thirteenth century. Yet there was in this Arabic influence little that tended to progress. Indeed, the most scholastic of the mediæval theologians and philosophers were those that were most under the influence of Arabic learning.

The universities, as we have seen, were dominated by the spirit of scholasticism, and while they conserved and diffused the learning of the past did little for the advancement of science in any of its branches.

Freedom of thought was greatly promoted by the disordered and divided state of the hierarchical church during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The skepticism of the nominalists became widely diffused.

The contact of Western Christians with the Greek learning of the East, during the fourteenth and the early part of the fifteenth centuries, and the emigration of Greek scholars to Italy, promoted the awakening interest in classical learning.

2. *Rise of the New Learning.*

In the thirteeth century the Latin and Greek classics, long since almost forgotten in the West, had begun to be studied and admired. Dante and Petrarch, the founders of Italian literature, had interested themselves in Latin poetry, and Boccaccio had applied himself to Greek poetry as well. By the middle of the fifteenth century considerable interest in classical studies had already been awakened in Italy.

The continued encroachment of the Turks upon the Greek Empire, and, finally, the fall of Constantinople (1453), caused a large number of Greek scholars to take refuge in Italy. Here they were welcomed, and their services as teachers of the Greek language and philosophy were in great demand. In 1450 a school was founded by Cosmo de' Medici for the promotion of classical studies. The writings of Plato were especially cultivated, and the Platonic philosophy was contrasted with the scholastic theology to the disadvantage of the latter. It was even shown that the schoolmen had not properly understood Aristotle, whom they professed to follow.

The study of antiquity became an enthusiasm. The monastic libraries were ransacked for manuscripts of the

Greek and Roman classics, which were regarded as more precious than gold. To write in a Ciceronian style became a great object of ambition and the study of Greek became the fashion of the day. The art of printing, discovered about the middle of the century, was a powerful auxiliary to the new learning. Architecture, painting, and sculpture participated in the great æsthetic awakening. Popes and civil rulers alike were lavish in their expenditures on literature, architecture, and the fine arts.

3. *Characteristics of the New Learning.*

(1) As might have been expected, the tendency of the one-sided cultivation of the Greek classics was to promote æsthetic, far more than religious advancement.

(2) The cultivation of the elegant literature of Greece and Rome incapacitated men for appreciating even the good elements of the barbarously written scholastic theology. The elevated sentiments and ideal conceptions of Platonism were held by many to be far more divine than the stiff formalism of a Thomas Aquinas.

(3) Such cultivation and admiration of classical literature was sure to lead to the extreme of denying the superiority of the Christian religion to paganism; but after the first reaction, a harmonizing of Christianity with Platonism was naturally attempted. This effort led to the study of the Neo-Platonic writings (Plotinus, Porphyry, Proclus, Pseudo-Dionysius, etc.), and to a comparison of these with the biblical writings in their original languages. Thus the study of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures was revived.

(4) This study of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, without scholastic prepossession, was sure to lead to a better understanding of the Scriptures and a better appreciation of the spirit of Christianity. Without the revival of learning, Colet, and Reuchlin, and Erasmus, and Luther, and Zwingli, and Calvin, would have been impossible.

(5) The Renaissance involved an earnest application of the mind to nature with the determination to penetrate its secrets. It involved a recognition of the dignity of life and of mind, and of the right and duty of the individual to cultivate his powers to the utmost, and to enjoy

in a rational way what nature has provided. The superstitions of the past had to give way before the spread of enlightenment by the new learning, with its new philosophy and its new science. The spirit of the Renaissance pervaded the religious, social, and political life of the time. The papacy itself came under its spell, and several of the popes were far more devoted to literature and art than to the interests of religion or even the maintenance of ecclesiastical power. Educational methods were revolutionized. Theology itself experienced a new birth at the hands of men like Pico de Mirandola, Reuchlin, Erasmus, and Colet. Philosophy was transformed under Nicolas of Cusa, Pico, Reuchlin, Agrippa of Nettesheim, and Galileo.

(6) We may say that in connection with the revival of learning, the principle of emancipation from authority in matters of thought and worship, which is the distinctive idea of modern times, as compared with mediæval, was developed. This idea, though a fundamental one in Protestantism, was not fully apprehended by the great Reformers. While it was claimed on their own behalf, it was not accorded to others. But it was so involved in the origin of the movement and in the spirit of the times, that it was perfectly sure of final recognition.

(7) The Reformation was, therefore, only a single phase of a movement which had already made considerable progress. The first manifestations of the modern spirit were humanistic, and were lacking in religious earnestness and zeal. The movement of which Erasmus was the best representative, only needed to have infused into it the patriotic and religious spirit of a Luther in order that it might be able to shake the religion of Europe to its very foundations.

CHAPTER II

THE PAPACY DURING THE MIDDLE AGES

I. THE POPES FROM 800–1044

LITERATURE: Greenwood, "*Cathedra Petri*," Vol. III., pp. 53–446; Milman, "Lat. Christianity," Vol. III.; Adams, "Hist. of Civilization dur. the Middle Ages"; Emerton, "An Introd. to the Study of the Middle Ages"; Bryce, "The Holy Roman Empire"; Eginhard, "Life of Charlemagne" (Eng. trans.); Hauck, "*Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*," *Bd.* II.; Simson, "*Jahrbücher d. Fränkischen Reichs unter Ludwig d. Fr.*"; Dümmler, "*Gesch. d. Ostfränk. Reichs*"; Wenck, "*Das Fränk. Reich nach dem Vertrag von Verdun*"; Simson, "*Die Entstehung d. Pseudisidorischen Fälschungen in Le Mans*"; Dümmler, "*Auxilius und Vulgarius: Quellen und Forschungen zur Gesch. d. Papstthums in Anfang d. X. Jahrhunderts*," 1866; Langen, "*Gesch. d. römischen Kirche von Nikolaus I. bis Gregor VII.*" 1892; Niehues, "*Gesch. d. Verhältnissen zwischen Kaisertum u. Papsttum im Mittelalter*," 1887; Gregorovius, "*Gesch. d. Stadt Rom*," *Bd.* III. (also Eng. trans.); Hefele, "*Konziliengeschichte*," *Bd.* IV.; Jaffé-Wattenbach, "*Regesta Pontificorum*"; articles on the various popes concerned in Herzog-Hauck and Wetzer u. Welte.

A FIRM alliance had been established between Charlemagne, king of the Franks, and Pope Hadrian I., each being pledged to use all of his resources for the advancement of the interests of the other. These interests were not thought of as in any sense antagonistic. The head of the great Christian civil power of the West was willing to recognize the ecclesiastical authority throughout his domains of the Roman pontiff, while the latter was ready to support with his spiritual authority the civil government of the Frankish ruler. It is probable that each looked upon his own authority as supreme and thought chiefly of the advantages he was to reap from the alliance; but both were so well satisfied with a mutually advantageous arrangement that it was not thought necessary to define rigorously the spheres of civil and ecclesiastical administration. By the joint efforts of pope and emperor the Saxons had been won to the empire and the church. In this both alike could rejoice. Charlemagne was eager to gain all the power and prestige that the pope could confer; but he had not the remotest idea of renouncing a particle of his own sovereignty over lands or persons.

1. To *Pope Leo III.* (795–816) was accorded the privilege of placing the imperial crown upon the head of the great Frankish monarch. The coronation of Charlemagne as emperor of the Romans marks an epoch in the history of the papacy no less than in the political history of Europe. As early as 774 Hadrian I. had made Charlemagne a Roman patrician. With the growth of his dominions and the complete withdrawal of the Eastern empire from effective interference in Italian politics, the importance of restoring the Roman Empire, and by this means legalizing and confirming the authority of his government, became more and more apparent to Charlemagne and his advisers. Shortly after the death of Hadrian, Leo had sent to Charlemagne the "keys of the confessional of St. Peter," along with the standard of the city, and had on behalf of the citizens of Rome tendered to him an oath of fidelity. In 799 Leo was driven from the city by a hostile faction. He visited the court of Charlemagne, and was assisted by him in regaining his authority.

In 800, having established peace and tranquillity throughout his vast realm, Charlemagne betook himself to Rome with the purpose, it can hardly be doubted, of securing recognition as the successor of the Cæsars. On Christmas Day, while he was kneeling with the pope at the altar prior to communion, the latter placed upon his head a jeweled crown, and the multitude cried out: "To Charles Augustus, crowned by God, the great and pacific emperor of the Romans, long life and victory."

Charlemagne affected to be surprised and somewhat shocked at this proceeding, but he at once exchanged the title of Patrician for that of Emperor Augustus, and compelled all his subjects to take a fresh oath of allegiance to him as such.

Leo was involved in local disturbances and by causing some of his enemies to be executed aroused a storm of opposition, which might have resulted disastrously for him had not death intervened.

2. *Stephen IV.* (816–817) crowned Louis the Pious and his bride at Rheims, the emperor having prostrated him-

self before the pope and treated him with greater consideration than had ever before been shown by an emperor to a pontiff.

3. *Gregory IV.* (827–844) was a feeble pope and was used by able but unscrupulous churchmen for the perpetration upon Christendom of a body of spurious documents in support of papal prerogative. The sons of the feeble emperor were in rebellion against him and had managed to get Gregory committed to their support. Yet he scrupled to take extreme measures against so pious an emperor. The Abbot of Wala and his associate, Paschasius Radbertus, overcame his scruples by exhibiting to him "certain writings and documents, founded on the authority and under the hands of his own holy predecessors," showing, among other things, "that in him dwelt the fullness of that living power which came down from God and the Apostle Peter, whereby he was ordained to be judge of all men and of all things; and in such wise that he himself should be judged of no man."[1] He no longer hesitated to complete the overthrow of Louis and to recognize Lothair, his son, as emperor (833). "The Field of Lies" was a term fittingly applied by contemporaries to this transaction and others that followed. Despite the wishes of Gregory and his advisers, the sons of Louis proceeded to apportion the empire among themselves and the unified civil government on which churchmen had counted so confidently for aid in the centralization of ecclesiastical authority was at an end.

Whether the documents presented to Gregory constituted the entire body of Pseudo-Isidorian decretals or only a limited number of spurious documents that formed the basis of the great collection is uncertain. But the full-grown collection was soon available and was used with the utmost confidence for the promotion of papal power and irresponsibility.

Gregory denounced the partition of the empire after the death of Louis (Treaty of Verdun, 843) and his authority was repudiated by the sons of Louis, whose conspiracy he had furthered. During his later years he was much occupied with defending Rome against the Saracens.

---

[1] Paschas. Radbertus, in his "*Vita Walæ,*" *Lib.* II., Chap. 16, quoted by Greenwood, Vol. III., p. 142.

4. *Nicholas I.* (858–867) came to the pontificate just after a time of wild disorder, when a rival claimant of the office had taken possession of the city, sacked the churches, destroyed the images, and imprisoned the pope (Benedict III.). Louis II. treated him with the utmost reverence. The imperial power was little more than a shadow. Feudalism had almost completed the work of disintegration. The domains of Louis II. were limited to a portion of Italy and he was willing to join hands with the pope for the extension of influence. The Saracens had been successfully repelled. Internal strife had subsided. Nicholas was glad to be protected against Frankish interference by an Italian kingdom. He had fully appropriated the teachings and implications of the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals and was prepared to wage a relentless warfare against any that should impugn the absolute sovereignty and the irresponsibility of the Roman See.

Archbishop John of Ravenna defied the pope's authority. He was deposed and anathematized, and was restored only after the most humiliating submission.

The right of appeal to Rome and the supreme jurisdiction of the pope were insisted upon by Nicholas and successfully enforced in a number of test cases.

Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, had deposed Bishop Rothald, of Soissons, because of his refusal to obey the mandates of a provincial synod. He appealed to the pope, who insisted on his being reinstated, and Hincmar was obliged to apologize to the pope and to recognize his right to interfere.

Lothair II. divorced his wife, Tietberga, and married Waldrada. Tietberga appealed to the pope, who espoused her cause, denounced Waldrada as a harlot, and insisted upon the right of the pope to exercise moral superintendence over civil rulers as being the sole source of their authority and responsible to God for their righteous administration.

5. *Hadrian II.* (867–872), an able and aggressive pope, was unable to hold the papacy at the point of influence reached by his predecessor. His attempt to fix the domains of Lothair II. upon the Emperor Louis II., in defiance of the claims of Charles the Bald, supported by the prevailing sentiment, secular and ecclesiastical, of the land, was a complete failure, and he was powerless to avenge the severe rebuke of Archbishop Hincmar.

6. *John VIII.* (872–882) was obliged to appeal to Charles

[illegible]

the Bald (now emperor) for protection against local enemies and the Saracens. The death of Charles (877) left him in a lamentable position. He was obliged to make a humiliating treaty with the Saracens. The Carlovingian Empire was approaching its end and the papacy became involved in the general dissolution of society.

7. *From Martin II. (882) to Christopher* (903). Never was the papacy more degraded than from 880–1000. After the breaking up of the Carlovingian Empire Europe lapsed into a state of almost complete anarchy. Italy was rent into fragments by contending factions. Bishoprics and abbeys were seized upon by warring nobles for their sons or other dependents. Bishops thus appointed were anything rather than pious or learned in theology. The papacy lost almost all its power and prestige and came to be a bone of contention among rival factions. Pope Formosus (891–898) having been treated with the utmost indignity by one party and having been enabled afterward to wreak bloody vengeance upon his enemies, was probably poisoned. He was succeeded (after fifteen days, during which Boniface VI. began and ended his pontifical reign) by his mortal enemy, Stephen VI., who had his body exhumed, tried, condemned, deposed, stripped of pontifical robes, cut to pieces, and thrown into the Tiber. The pontifical acts of Formosus were of course abrogated by Stephen. In about a year the other party triumphed and Stephen was imprisoned and strangled. Stephen's successor, Marinus, reigned four months and Marinus' successor three weeks. John X. was elected by the party that had sustained Formosus (898) and devoted his energies to annulling the proceedings of Stephen. Leo V. (903) having reigned for two months was murdered by his chaplain, who succeeded him. The murderer was murdered and succeeded by Sergius III., after eight months of pontifical glory.

8. *The Pornocracy.* With Sergius was inaugurated what is ~~known in~~ history as the *Pornocracy*. Marozia, a licentious noblewoman, as mistress of Sergius, directed the papal government for seven years. His successor John X. was appointed by his mistress Theodora. He led in person a successful military expedition against the Saracens, but returned to be driven into exile by Marozia.

Through the influence of another licentious woman he succeeded in reinstating himself, but through the influence of Marozia he was soon afterward strangled in a dungeon. The next three popes were creatures of Marozia, the third (John XI.) her bastard son by Pope Sergius, a youth of twenty-one. From 936 to 956 a sort of Roman Republic, with Alberic at its head, prevailed. Alberic appointed four popes in succession and restrained them from political interference. A son of Alberic (a boy of twelve or, as others say, eighteen), profligate beyond his years, succeeded his father in the civil government and moreover assumed the papal office (John XII.). He was charged by his contemporaries with the violation of almost every principle of morality and religion: sacrilege, adultery, violation of widows, living with his father's mistress, invocation of Jupiter and Venus, and turning the papal palace into a brothel. He was driven from the city at the request of the people by the aid of the German emperor Otho before whom he had been tried. After a time he was restored through the intervention of harlots, but was soon afterward killed by the injured husband of a paramour.

The authority of Otho the Great was increasing and he was earnestly endeavoring to bring order out of chaos. He secured control in Italy in 962 and from that time assumed the responsibility of appointing popes. Thus the papacy was delivered from the debasing position into which it had fallen and was enabled to enter anew upon the aggressive policy that had so long been kept in abeyance. The tradition of past greatness was still preserved and with the revival of the Holy Roman Empire by Otho the papacy entered upon a career of brilliant conquest.

9. *Otho the Great and the Papacy*. In 962, following the example of Charlemagne, Otho sought to fortify his imperial authority by receiving anointing, although he had already assumed the imperial crown, at the hands of the pope, even the disreputable John XII. Otho is said to have solemnly promised to do all that in him lay to exalt the Church of Rome and her pastor, and to protect them in the enjoyment of their dignities and territorial possessions. When John's vicious life was brought to his attention he treated the matter lightly, expressing the hope

that with increasing age he would learn to conduct himself with more propriety. But on learning, soon afterward, that John was seeking to induce Greeks and Hungarians to invade Italy and to expel the Germans, he proceeded to capture Rome, and in 963 convoked a synod of bishops and cardinals for the deposition of the pope and the appointment of a successor. A layman was appointed pope under the name Leo VIII. On Otho's withdrawal from Italy John was able to drive out the new pope and to reoccupy the papal chair. John died in 964 and his friends appointed a successor under the name Benedict V. Otho returned to Italy, recaptured Rome, and convoked a synod of bishops from the various divisions of his empire, which deposed Benedict. Leo VIII., with the approval of the synod, issued a decree recognizing the right of Otho and his successors to nominate thenceforth the rulers of Italy, to appoint all future popes, and to invest all archbishops and bishops.

After the death of Otho I. Italy relapsed into anarchy and the papacy shared the same fate. Murder, intrusion, and robbery resumed their sway. Otho III., however, regained control and appointed Gerbert, one of the most learned men of the time, pope, under the name of Sylvester II. (999). Gerbert had studied in Cordova under Saracen scholars, and his scientific knowledge was so much in advance of that of his contemporaries, that he was suspected of practising "black magic" (witchcraft). Otho is said to have added at this time eight counties to the States of the Church, though the authenticity of the deed has been called in question. Sylvester II. was the first French pope, and the first pope, so far as is known, to propose a crusade for the deliverance of the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the Saracens.

Henry II. (1002–1024) was noted for his religious zeal. He rebuked the vices of clergy, high and low, promoted men to ecclesiastical offices on the ground of merit, and instituted vigorous measures for reforming the church. Conrad II. and Henry III. (1024–1056) pursued the same general policy; but the Italian clergy proved irreformable. Benefices were bought and sold with the utmost recklessness; licentiousness was rampant. Henry III. in his zeal for reform called a synod at Sutri (1046), summoned Pope Gregory VI., deposed him for simony, along with the pope from whom he had purchased the office and another rival pope, and appointed a respectable German bishop, Suidgar of Bamberg, to the position under the name Clement II. Henry purposed to carry out the good work thus begun into every department of ecclesiastical government and life. In 1049 Bruno, bishop of Torel, Henry's uncle, was elevated to the papacy as Leo IX., who forthwith associated with himself Hildebrand as subdeacon and administrator of the Patrimony of Peter. With the co-operation of the emperor strenuous measures were entered upon for the abolition of simony and immorality among the clergy. Many of the more upright clergy rejoiced in his well directed efforts and heartily co-operated with him.

It should be noted that the close of the first millennium was looked forward to by many Christians with grave apprehension as the date of the closing of the dispensation, or the end of the world. Otho III. shared in this morbid anxiety. When the year 1000 passed without a catastrophe there was universal rejoicing.

II. THE HILDEBRANDINE SCHEME OF REFORM.

LITERATURE: Greenwood, Vol. IV., pp. 139–422; Milman, Vol. IV.; Stephens, "Hildebrand and His Times"; Stephen, "Essays in Eccl. Biog.," "Hildebrand"; Bowden, "Life and Pontif. of Greg. VII."; Voigt, "Hildebrand"; Villemain, "*Hist. de Grégoire VII.*"; Lilly, "Chapters in Europ. Hist.," Vol. I.; Giesebrecht, "*Gesch. d. deutsch. Kaiserzeit*," *Bd.* III.; Gregorovius, "*Gesch. d. Stadt Rom*" (and Eng. trans.); Hauck, "*Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*," *Bd.* III., 1896; Langen, "*Gesch. d. röm. Kirche von Nikolaus I. bis Gregory VII.*"; Mirbt, "*Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.*," 1894; Martens, "*Greg. VII., sein Leben u. Wirken*," 1894; Potthast, "*Bibliotheca Historica Medii Ævi*," second ed., 1896; Sägmüller, "*Die Thätigkeit u. Stellung d. Kardinäle bis Papst Bonifaz VIII.*," 1896; Bryce, p. 159, *seq.*; Freeman, "Norm. Conq." (see Index); works of Hildebrand and Peter Damiani; Jaffé-Wattenbach, "*Regesta Pontificum*"; Alzog, Sec. 214.

1. *Hildebrand as the Maker and Ruler of Popes.* As the Roman hierarchy gradually regained its power under the ~~fostering care of the emperors~~, a high church party came to the front under the leadership of Hildebrand, which resented civil interference in matters of religion as outrageous and sacrilegious, and sought to emancipate the church from dependence upon civil rulers by centralizing all ecclesiastical authority in the papacy. Hildebrand,

of whose early history scarcely anything is known, seems to have been born about 1020 of plebeian Italian parents. He first appears as chaplain of Gregory VI. (1044–1046), resided at Clugny, where he carried forward his education and became filled with monkish zeal (1046–1049), became subdeacon and cardinal under Leo IX. (1049), and thenceforth controlled the papal policy as the chief statesman of the Roman Curia until 1073, when by the acclamation of the people and clergy of Rome, ratified by the cardinals, he became pope. He had dictated the appointment of several of his predecessors and might on several occasions have secured election for himself, but he preferred up to this time to labor in a subordinate position and assumed the tiara at last under strong pressure. He was unquestionably the greatest ecclesiastical statesman of the Middle Ages. In him the spirit of the papacy became incarnate. He identified papal supremacy in the most absolute way with the will of God and allowed nothing to stand in the way of the realization of his ideal of universal papal dominion in spiritual and secular things. With a shrewdness rarely equaled and a boldness of conception and action never surpassed, he set to work to utilize the current reforming spirit for the building up of ecclesiastical authority. His aim was to take disciplinary power out of the hands of civil rulers and to use it for the complete subjugation of clergy and laity to the pope. More definitely stated, the policy of the Hildebrandine party was: (1) To free the papacy and the church in general from lay interference. (2) To reduce all metropolitans, bishops, abbots, and clergy to absolute subjection to the papacy. (3) To reduce civil rulers to the necessity of acting in the papal interests.

Kur

2. *Decrees of the Roman Synod of 1059.* Advantage was taken by the Hildebrandine party of the death of Henry III. (1059) and the infancy of his successor to inaugurate the new policy. At a synod convened in Rome the following points were settled: (1) Nomination of popes restricted to cardinal bishops. After the nomination the cardinal clergy to be brought in. After these bodies have agreed, the nomination to be brought before the inferior clergy and the laity for approval. A terrible

anathema involving excommunication, "the wrath of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit and the fury of the Apostles Peter and Paul" is pronounced upon all who shall impugn this decree. (2) No clerk under any pretense whatever to accept church or benefice from or by procurement of any lay person or be amenable to lay jurisdiction. (3) No Christian man shall hear mass sung by any priest known to keep a concubine. This included all married priests, as no distinction was made by the Hildebrandine party between married and concubinary clergy.

3. *Peter Damiani the Coadjutor of Hildebrand.* Peter Damiani (born *c.* 1007 at Ravenna) early became a pronounced ascetic and a leading writer on ascetical subjects, was appointed cardinal bishop of Ostia, the highest position in the college of cardinals (1057), and was thenceforth the ablest literary defender of the Hildebrandine scheme. He maintained that every invasion of the prerogative of the Roman Church is heresy and should be dealt with as such; that all law, even the law of God himself, may be set aside if this should be deemed by the church necessary for the accomplishment of its purposes; that the divine law bends to the exigencies of the church; that the present interests of the church, the church itself being the judge, represent God's will and must be secured even if the violation of God's will otherwise expressed be involved; that the church may and should violate any compacts made with civil rulers if contrary to the interests of the church. He did not say it in so many words, but it is clearly implied, that the end justifies the means and that no faith is to be kept with heretics. He fully sympathized with Hildebrand in his uncompromising warfare against simony and clerical marriage.

Peter Damiani's idea of the relations of the papacy and the empire is succinctly set forth in the following paragraph from his "*Disceptatio Synodalis*": "The supreme priesthood and the Roman Empire should be joined together in mutual compact to the end that the human race, which is ruled in both respects (ecclesiastical and civil) through these two supreme powers, may be rent asunder in none of its parts, and so the eminences of the world may concur in a union of perpetual love, . . to the end that these two exalted personages may be joined together with so great unanimity that by a certain cement of mutual love the king may be found in the Ro man pontiff and the Roman pontiff in the king." He did not always work harmoniously with Hildebrand, whose supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs he resented. The following caustic epigram (written in verse) expresses his feelings: "The pope I rightly worship, but thee I prostrate adore: thou makest him lord, he makes thee God." He died in 1072.

This scheme involved a desperate struggle with the clergy on the one hand and the civil rulers on the other. In this struggle Hildebrand availed himself fully of all the means of influence that the past had placed within his reach,—monastic orders, forged decretals, popular superstitions, and admiration for asceticism, etc.

4. *Hildebrand's Achievements.* (1) In the face of the gravest difficulties and the most determined opposition on the part of the clergy he remorselessly enforced the law of celibacy. Married clergy were stigmatized as concubinaries, or worse; the people were forbidden to confess to them or to receive religious service of any kind from them; monks were commissioned to go into parishes where there was a reluctance to obey and to arouse popular sentiment against recalcitrant clergy to such an extent that they were compelled in many cases either to renounce their wives or flee. Bishops and abbots were refused recognition in case they had secured appointment through lay influence. They must either renounce any sort of dependence on the lay patrons and submit themselves absolutely to the pope or see their offices usurped by papal appointees. There was much resistance, but Hildebrand was for the most part able to carry his point.

(2) The civil rulers were very reluctant to abandon the patronage they had enjoyed from time immemorial. By the use of the interdict and other means of making his power felt, Hildebrand gained some great triumphs over his lay adversaries, notably over the Emperor Henry IV. The humiliation of Henry at Canossa became one of the most noted events in the history of the struggle of Church and State for supremacy.

(3) Besides reducing the clergy into almost complete submission, securing a general recognition of the papal marriage laws and humiliating the emperor, Hildebrand fully established the *legatine power*, by virtue of which

he had duly accredited and fully recognized representatives in all parts of his constituency. The legates were chiefly monks, whose training had been such that he could delegate large powers to them in full assurance that they would represent him faithfully. Thus the pope was able to be virtually omnipresent so far as the interests of the hierarchy were concerned. Yet in no respect was his triumph complete. Henry did not long remain in the Canossa frame, but was soon capturing Rome and driving the pope from his throne. Neither did he fully succeed in subjugating the clergy.

(4) He employed the interdict for the enforcing of ecclesiastical censures far more effectively than any of his predecessors had been able to do.

(5) Yet he died in exile, having been driven from the city by his lifelong enemy, Henry IV. His dying words are characteristic of the man: "Because I have always loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile."

5. *Hildebrand's Claims Regarding Papal Prerogative.* The position of Hildebrand in the history of the development of the papacy is so important as to justify the quotation of some of his more striking utterances on papal prerogative. In a letter to William the Conqueror he writes:

> Like the two great luminaries fixed by the Creator in the firmament of the heaven to give light to his creatures, so also hath he ordained two great powers on earth by which all men are to be governed and preserved from error. These powers are the pontifical and the royal; but the former is the greater, the latter the lesser light. Yet under both the religion of Christ is so ordered that, by God's assistance, the apostolical power shall govern the royal; and Scripture teacheth that the apostolic and pontifical dignity is ordained to be responsible for all Christian kings, nay, for all men, before the divine tribunal, and to render an account to God for their sins. If, therefore, I be answerable before the dreadful judgment seat, judge ye whether ye are not bound upon the peril of your soul, and as you desire to possess your kingdom in peace, *to yield unto me unconditional obedience*, for that is no more than to prefer the honor of God to your own honor and to love him in a pure mind, with all your heart and with all your strength.

Exhorting his subjects to renounce their allegiance to Henry IV. he writes:

> For this reason we cry aloud and spare not; as saith the prophet: "If thou declare not unto the wicked his evil way, his blood will I require at thy hand"; and again: "Cursed be he that withholdeth the sword from blood." God is herein our witness, that we are not moved by any desire of temporal advantage or by carnal respects of any kind in reproving wicked princes or imperious priests; but that all we do is done from pure regard for our high office and for the honor and prerogative of the Apostolic See; for it were a hundredfold better that we should suffer the death of the body by the hand of the tyrant than for our own profit or from fear to hold our peace and therein consent to the overthrow of the Christian law; for we are clearly taught by the holy fathers that he upon whom the duty resteth, yet neglecteth to resist the wicked man, in reality consenteth unto the evil, and himself commits the sin it was his duty to punish.

Defending his right to excommunicate princes, having cited a number of false decretals, he goes on to say:

> But perhaps there are persons who will pretend that when God thrice committed his church to the blessed Peter by the words "feed my sheep," he excepted kings. But let them reflect that when he gave to Peter the power to bind and loose in heaven and on earth, he excepted nothing out of that power. He that denies that he may be bound by the chains of the church must go on to affirm that he cannot be absolved by the same authority. But whosoever affirms this separates himself from the body of Christ; and verily if the Apostolic See, by virtue of the principality divinely conferred, adjudicates upon spiritual things, why should it not have power to adjudicate in temporal things also? The kings and princes of this world who prefer their own honor and temporal advantage to the righteousness of God are, as you well know, the members of him whom they serve; they, on the other hand, who prefer the will of God to their own will, and obey him rather than man, are members of Christ, just as the former are members of antichrist. If therefore spiritual men are when needful themselves brought to judgment, why should they not have power to punish carnal men for their evil lives? But perchance they imagine that the royal dignity is superior to the episcopal. Now let us try the two powers by their source and origin. The former was engendered *in human pride*, the latter *in divine religion;* the one is incessantly grasping at empty glory, the latter always aspiring to celestial life.

In connection with the second excommunication of Henry IV., Hildebrand concludes an elaborate document as follows:

> And now, O ye princes and fathers, most holy Apostles Peter and Paul, deal ye with us in such wise that all the world may know and understand that you, having power to bind and to loose in heaven, have the like power upon earth, according to men's merits

to give and to take away empires, kingdoms, principalities, dukedoms, marquisates, earldoms, and all manner of human rights and properties, for have you not oftentimes taken away patriarchates, primacies, archbishoprics, and bishoprics, from the unworthy and given them to religious men? And having such mighty power in spiritual things, what is there on earth that may transcend your authority in temporal things? And if you judge the angels, who are high above the proudest of princes, what may you not do unto those beneath them? Let the kings and princes of the earth know and feel how great you are, how exalted your power. Let them tremble to despise the commands of your church. But upon the said Henry do judgment quickly, that all men may know that it is not by fortune or chance, but by your power that he has fallen. May he thus be confounded unto repentance that his soul may be saved in the day of the Lord.

6. *The Hildebrandine Theocratic Scheme in its Relation to Civil and Religious Liberty.* The following general statement on this topic from an article by the author, entitled "Liberty and Creed,"[1] may be here reproduced:

The Hildebrandine scheme, which owed many of its features to Hildebrand's great contemporary, Peter Damiani, represents the ideal of the theocracy in an almost completed form. The church is conceived of as an institution absolutely divine. It consists virtually of the hierarchy, the great body of the laity being in the position of materials to be ruled and exploited. The pope is the head of the sacerdotal body, through which alone it is possible for mankind to derive spiritual blessings. The church, with its papal head, is conceived of as that for whose welfare the world exists, and to whose interest everything else is secondary. Civil governments exist only by divine (papal) permission and that they may subserve the interests of the church.

God's supreme concern being for the dominion of the church, he has bestowed upon Peter and his successors, the bishops of Rome, all the power that would belong to Christ if he were personally reigning on earth. The pope is the vicar of Christ. As Peter exhibited two swords and his Master said it is enough (not too many), so to his successors have been committed the spiritual and the secular dominion. Civil rulers rightly occupy their positions only by virtue of the approval of the vicar of Christ. As perfect unity and harmony in the administration of the world are the ideal to be attained, and there can be no center of unity other than the divinely appointed vicar of Christ, all secular rulers and all ecclesiastical rulers must submit themselves absolutely to his authority. To tolerate civil or ecclesiastical insubordination, where power to suppress it exists, would be in the highest degree blameworthy.

As the divine will is identical with the maintenance and advancement of this ecclesiastical authority, any available means may be employed to this end, even though the divine will, as expressed in Scripture and in conscience, must be violated. Does heresy arise and spread? It must be rooted out, although in the process multitudes of the faithful themselves may be destroyed. Does a civil ruler resist the encroachment of the papal power? His throne may be declared vacant and offered to any Catholic prince who will seize it, the allegiance of the subjects forbidden, an interdict placed upon the administration of the sacraments of the church until submission shall have been made, a deadly crusade preached against the kingdom. Everything was on principle subordinated to this one central aim of securing absolute temporal as well as absolute spiritual dominion. The Crusades in the East were fostered and forced, when need appeared, in the interest of this world dominion. The union of the kings of Europe under the papal banner in this great enterprise was in itself a great achievement for the papacy. The hope of subduing the Eastern empire and the Mohammedan power greatly added to the interest of the papacy in these terribly destructive expeditions. The securing of vast territorial possessions in Europe through skillful use of advantages offered by the Crusades was in the highest degree promotive of the papal aim of universal dominion.

---

[1] "American Journal of Theology," January, 1898.

Here we have a theocracy of the most complete type. The pope, as the head of the theocracy, occupies the place of God on earth, and he is free, as even God is not, to make use of the most immoral means for the enforcement of his authority. The scheme is a magnificent one. It provides for the uniform administration of the world from a single center, according to a single ideal. Its advocates no doubt believed that such a government, putting an end, as it would, to civil and religious strife, would result in universal peace, universal good will, universal righteousness. Yet it is easy to see that to realize or perpetuate such a system, civil and religious freedom must be remorselessly suppressed. The only freedom possible would be that enjoyed by those who were thoroughly in sympathy with the ideal of the theocracy and who found their highest delight in submission to its authority.

Imp.

III. THE CONTROVERSY ON INVESTITURE AND THE CONCORDAT OF WORMS (1122).

LITERATURE: Greenwood, Vol. IV., p. 672, *seq.;* Milman, Vol. IV., p. 144, *seq.;* Bryce, p. 163; Hinschius, "*Kirchenrecht d. Katholischen u. Protestanten*," *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 530-608; Meltzer, "*Papst Gregor VII. u. d. Bishofswahlen*," second ed., 1876; Witte, "*Forschungen zur Gesch. d. Wormser Konkordates*," 1877.

1. *Grounds of the Controversy.* The term "investiture" designates the conferring of the insignia of office upon bishops, abbots, etc. That the civil rulers should have insisted on exercising this function grew out of the feudal relations that subsisted between them and their ecclesiastical beneficiaries. As members of the feudal state, having territorial possessions corresponding with

those of the larger subordinate nobles, bishops and abbots enjoyed the same privileges and immunities as the secular nobles, participated like these in the general legislation and administration, and were naturally expected to share the burdens of common defense and administration. Kings who had set apart great tracts of land for bishoprics and abbacies could not afford to allow the administration of these lands to fall into hostile or indifferent hands, and might have been expected to insist on nominating to these positions trusted men who would swear fealty to them. It was against the exercise of this right that Hildebrand and his successors carried on a determined warfare. To receive investiture was declared to be simony, and was regarded as incapacitating the recipient for the valid performance of ecclesiastical functions; and for a civil ruler to arrogate to himself the right to bestow investiture was looked upon as a sacrilegious intrusion.

2. *The Concordat of Worms.* After the death of Gregory VII. the struggle between emperor and pope continued with varying results, the pope holding the balance of power between the emperor and other rulers, but being for much of the time an exile from Rome, with a rival pope of imperial appointment in his place. In 1122 peace was made between Calixtus II. and Henry V. on the following conditions: (1) Elections to bishoprics and abbeys in the emperor's dominions to be held in the emperor's presence, without simony or any kind of compulsion, the emperor to have the right to decide in disputed elections. (2) The bishop or abbot elect to receive from the emperor the temporalities of the office by the delivery of a rod or sceptre, the pope to have the sole right of investing with the ring and crozier. (3) The pope to absolve all who had incurred ecclesiastical disabilities through attachment to the emperor, the emperor to restore in full the territorial possessions of the Roman See and to lend his aid to the pope whenever required.

It is scarcely needful to say that neither party adhered to the agreement any longer than convenience dictated. The imperial advantages of the Concordat were formally abandoned in 1125 by Lothair III. as the price of urgently needed papal support.

IV. THE HOHENSTAUFEN EMPERORS AND THE POPES.

LITERATURE: Greenwood, Vol. V., pp. 57-668; Vol. VI., pp. 1-109; Milman, Vol. IV., pp. 261-554; Bryce, pp. 166-220; Alzog, Sec. 219-224; Balzani, "*The Popes and the Hohenstaufen*"; Raumer, "*Gesch. d. Hohenstaufen*"; Hurter, "*Inn. III.*"; Reuter, "*Alex. III.*"; Freeman and Froude on Thomas a Becket; Geffcken, "Church and State"; Ribbeck, "*Fred. I. u. d. Römische Kurie,*" 1881; Giesebrecht, "*Gesch. d. Deutschen Kaiserzeit,*" 1885; Wolfram, "*Fred. I. u. d. Wormser Concordat*"; Prutz, "*Kaiser Fred. I.,*" 1871-74; Hunt, "The Eng. Ch. in the Middle Ages," 1888; Deutsch, "*Papst Innocent III. u. sein Einfluss auf d. Kirche,*" 1876; Wattenbach, "*Gesch. d. römischen Papstthums,*" 1876; Gregorovius, "*Gesch. d. Stadt Rom im Mittelalter,*" *Bd.* V. (also Eng. tr.); Stubbs, "Constitutional History of England," Vol. I., p. 520, *seq.*

A new line of German emperors began with Conrad III. in 1137. With Frederick I. (Barbarossa) was renewed a bitter conflict that was to last for centuries. The name of the chief German antagonist of the emperor (the Duke of Welf) was transferred to Italy as the party name of the supporters of papal absolutism under the form Guelf. The imperial supporters accepted the name Ghibelline (Waibeling).

1. *Alexander III. (1159-1181).*

(1) *Contest with Frederick Barbarossa.* Frederick, the greatest of the Hohenstaufens, invaded Italy in 1158 with one hundred and fifteen thousand troops. He attempted to reconstruct both civil and ecclesiastical governments. He filled vacant bishoprics with men of his own party. He bestowed the estates of the Countess Matilda, the friend of Hildebrand, which had been left to the Roman See, upon the Duke of Bavaria. Hadrian IV., who died in 1159, is said to have been the first pope to set up the claim of exclusive jurisdiction.[1] Alexander III., who as cardinal had for some time directed the movements of the ultra-papal party, was chosen by a small majority (1159). The minority of the cardinals, supported by the clergy, Senate, and people of Rome, set up a rival (Victor IV.). The emperor called a council to adjudicate the matter. Alexander treated with contempt the imperial summons.[2] The council decided in favor of Victor. Alexan-

---

[1] Greenwood, Vol. V., p. 94.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. V., p. 107.

der denounced the procedure in vigorous language and appealed to the nations. He secured the support of England, France, Spain, Hungary, and Sicily. Frederick captured Rome in 1166, but immediately afterward his army was attacked by pestilence and he was obliged to withdraw with a small fraction of it surviving. This was a partial victory for Alexander, but his rival still held the Roman See. Again in 1174 Frederick invaded Italy, but in 1176 he suffered a disastrous defeat. In the treaty of Agnani the emperor renounced the anti-pope and agreed to restore the Patrimony of Peter, including the estates of Matilda. In the treaty of Venice (1177) the emperor abandoned all claims to sovereignty within the pontifical territory, and submitted himself in the most abject way to the pope, the sole condition being that he and his wife should be recognized as emperor and empress of the Romans.

(2) *The Council of the Lateran (1179).* This council attempted to settle the title and territorial claims of the pope and to unite Christendom in opposition to heresy, which was making alarming headway. The basis of the Inquisition was here laid. The law as to the election of popes was made so definite as entirely to exclude any participation therein by the emperor or by the clergy and people of Rome. The Hildebrandine laws against simony were restated with emphasis, and it was decreed that no pecuniary burden or tax of any kind should be imposed upon the clergy for any secular purpose. Christian princes and people are called upon to take up arms against heresy and are assured of plenary indulgence while engaged in this work, with full forgiveness of sins in case of death.[1]

(3) *Alexander and ~~England~~.* Henry II. was a strong-willed and arrogant ruler. Since the Norman conquest the ecclesiastical power had been encroaching more and more upon the civil. The national spirit was being developed anew and Henry represented this spirit in its extreme form. In 1163 Thomas a Becket, by the king's mandate, was made archbishop of Canterbury. Henry had reason to expect a large measure of subserviency

---

[1] Greenwood, Vol. V., p. 190.

from Becket. In this he was sadly mistaken. Becket had not been long in office before he showed himself the almost fanatical advocate of papal absolutism. The Constitutions of Clarendon were adopted in 1164 by a great national council called by Henry. The articles of the constitution forbid the encroachment of ecclesiastical courts on the civil, restrain English prelates from going to Rome without the king's license, and forbid the exercise by the pope or by his representatives of excommunication or interdict without the king's license. The king is to constitute the highest court of appeal. Ecclesiastical vacancies are to be filled under the direction of the king, and the revenues during vacancies are to go into the royal exchequer. These constitutions struck at the root of papal pretensions. Becket resisted the royal policy in the most determined and insulting way. Ill feeling steadily increased between Henry and Becket, until at last the former became so exasperated as to procure the assassination of the latter. The martyrdom of Becket turned the tide of sentiment against Henry in favor of the papal cause. England was put under an interdict and Henry was compelled to humiliate himself and to abrogate the Constitutions of Clarendon in 1172.

2. *Innocent III. (1188–1216).*

Innocent was one of the ablest and by far the most successful of popes. He came to the office at the most favorable time. He had the work of Hildebrand and Alexander III. behind him. The Crusades had given immense authority and vast resources to the church, and the crusading spirit was still at its height. Canon law was fully developed and the great intellectual activity that resulted from the Crusades was manifesting itself in the founding of universities, a chief object of which was the defense of church dogma. Innocent had completely grasped the papal idea of absolute civil and ecclesiastical control, and he approached more nearly to a realization of this idea than any other pope ever did. He was the first pope to designate himself *the representative of God on earth.*

(1) *Relation of Innocent to the Empire.* Henry VI. had left an infant son. His widow was under the influence

of Innocent, and she appointed him guardian of the future emperor and regent of his hereditary domain. A struggle over the imperial dignity having arisen between Philip of Swabia (Guelf) and Otho IV. (Hohenstaufen), Innocent had the privilege of deciding between them. Without committing himself fully to either, he favored the cause of Otho. Philip's popularity grew so great that Innocent was on the point of recognizing him as emperor when he was assassinated. The way was now clear for him to crown Otho, which he soon did. Otho having attained to the object of his ambition grew insolent and insubordinate, and undertook to meddle with Italian affairs. His enemies in Germany were so many and strong that Innocent had little difficulty in deposing him and putting Frederick II. on the imperial throne. Frederick disappointed the papal expectations. He had received the crown on the two-fold condition that on the birth of a son he should resign the crown of Sicily, and that he should organize and lead a crusade within the next three years. This latter promise Frederick was most reluctant to fulfill. Innocent failed during the four years that remained to him to induce him to fulfill his promise, and the spirit of insubordination that led to the prolonged conflict between Frederick and the successors of Innocent, to the excommunication of Frederick, to his determination to put an end to papal tyranny, to his fulfilling his crusading vow in an independent crusade, and his crowning himself in the church of the Holy Sepulchre, etc., was manifest long before the death of Innocent.

(2) *Innocent's Dealings with Other Rulers and Countries.* In England King John for political reasons insisted upon the appointment of John de Grey to the archbishopric of Canterbury. Part of the electors refused to vote for John de Grey and set up a rival. Both parties appealed to Rome. Innocent set aside both claimants and caused the appointment of Stephen Langton, whom he duly consecrated. King John was exasperated, and in response to the pope's threat to put England under an interdict, he threatened to banish the clergy and mutilate every Italian he could lay hands upon. After many threats and counter-threats, Innocent excommunicated John, released his subjects from their fealty, and called

upon Christian princes to depose him and take the kingdom. John was very unpopular at home, and Philip Augustus of France, with the papal support, was preparing to take possession of England. John was reduced to such straits that he was glad to surrender his kingdom to the pope and to receive it back as a fief. By reason of his blundering dealings in civil and ecclesiastical matters and the disgrace that he had thus brought upon the country, the barons levied war against him and compelled him to sign Magna Charta, the great charter of the liberties of the English people. Innocent compelled Alphonso of Spain to break off a matrimonial engagement with his niece. He compelled Philip Augustus of France to take back his divorced wife. He summoned Peter of Aragon to Rome, took away his crown and restored it only on condition that he should recognize the pope's sovereignty by the payment of an annual tribute. His influential interference in political matters extended to Hungary, Poland, Norway, and even to the East, where his supporters founded in 1203 a Latin empire. The glory of this performance was short-lived, but he had the satisfaction of governing a patriarch of Constantinople, and thus gratifying an inveterate ambition of the papacy. The fact is that he had his hand upon every part of the political and ecclesiastical machinery of Christendom and was generally able to carry his point.

(3) *The Fourth Lateran Council* (*1215*). When the papal power had reached its zenith shortly before the death of its most mighty pope, one of the most august and important councils of the Middle Ages was held in Rome. There were in attendance seventy-one primates and archbishops, four hundred and twelve bishops, and eight hundred priors and abbots. East and West participated. Most of the Oriental patriarchates were represented. The organization of a new crusade was the most prominent topic of discussion. It was enacted that the "peace of God" be kept among Christian princes for five years to this end. Union with the Greek Church was also considered. The doctrine of Transubstantiation was now for the first time defined in opposition to the followers of Berengarius and to evan-

gelical dissent. The word itself seems to have been now first used. Ample provision was made for the persecution of heretics. Toleration of heresy was made a ground for punishment and even death.

3. *The Papacy During the Thirteenth Century.*

(1) *Guelfs and Ghibellines.* The most uncompromising warfare was waged between the emperor and the popes during the lifetime of Frederick II. (d. 1250), who had been greatly embittered against the papacy by the arrogant conduct of Innocent III. Identifying Christianity with priestcraft he seems to have become an avowed unbeliever, and his contact with Mohammedanism during the crusade in which he engaged led to his adopting the modes of life and thought of the arch-enemies of Christianity. He interested himself in Saracen science and philosophy, had Saracens in his court, used Mohammedan soldiers to fight against Christians, and maintained a harem of Saracen women. Every community was divided into factions by this long-continued feud and bloody encounters were frequent. In 1241 Gregory IX. convoked a council. About one hundred prelates, who had embarked at Genoa for Rome, were captured by Enzio, son of Frederick, and a number of them murdered. On the election of Innocent IV. (1243), Frederick is said to have remarked: "As cardinal, Fieschi was my friend; but as pope, he will be my enemy. No pope can be a Ghibelline." A council held at Lyons in 1245 excommunicated and deposed Frederick for infidelity, heresy, perjury, sacrilege, and collusion with the Saracens. Frederick died in the midst of a campaign against the supporters of the papacy, having during the last years of his life treated the popes and their supporters with every conceivable indignity.

(2) *Gregory IX.* (1227–1241), a nephew of Innocent III., was more explicit than his great relative in the assertion of the absolute authority of the papacy. He declared that the pope "possesses the principality of the whole world (*in universo mundo*) of things and of persons (*rerum et corporum*)." Gregory published five books of decretals, to counteract the imperial legislation of Frederick, and these became part of the "Body of Canon Law."

(3) *Innocent IV.* (1243–1254) attempted still further to fortify the assertion of universal and absolute papal domination. He denied that Constantine had given secular power to the papacy, which possesses this power directly from Christ himself, who founded a kingdom and gave to Peter the keys both of heavenly and earthly authority. He insisted that it is the duty of every clerical person to obey the pope even if he should command what is wrong (unless heresy be involved). Laymen need only to know that there is a God who rewards the good, and, for the rest, they are to believe implicitly what the church believes. Bishops and pastors need to know well the Apostles' Creed; other clergy need know no more than the laity, except that the body of Christ is made in the sacrament of the altar.

(4) *Clement IV.* (1265–1268) asserted the right of the Roman pontiff to dispose of all benefices vacant or otherwise according to his good pleasure. By this decree he intended to give legitimacy to the practice of selling expectancies, already becoming an important source of papal revenue. This proceeding seems to have called forth the pragmatic sanction of Louis IX., the great crusader and champion of the church. The pragmatic sanction was an assertion of the liberties of the French church (Gallicanism) over against papal claims of universal jurisdiction. "The kingdom of France, recognizing no other superior or protector than God Almighty, is independent of all men, and consequently of the pope." It involves a vigorous protest against the corrupt and extortionate methods of raising money employed by the papacy and the attempt of the papacy to dominate the civil governments, and insists on the restoration of the church to its primitive spirituality and purity.

(5) *Gregory X.* (1271–1276) made a desperate but wholly unsuccessful effort to inaugurate a new crusade, and in connection with a council at Lyons (1274) succeeded in inducing the feeble Eastern emperor and some of the Greek bishops to assent to the doctrines of the Roman Church and to the supremacy of the pope. But this affiliation was looked upon with such abhorrence in the East that fasts, ablutions, and processions were resorted to as a means of expiating the guilt involved.

Excommunication and punishment of heresy was made the duty of Christian princes and of all the faithful. To facilitate the conviction of heretics it was made obligatory upon every Christian to confess and receive the Eucharist at least once a year. Failure to do this was to incur the penalty of excommunication and persecution for heresy. In general the object of the council was to consolidate, conserve, and extend the power and prerogatives that had been attained. The Inquisition was not yet formally established, but its principles were enacted.

4. *Theocratic Principles Established at the Death of Innocent III.*

(1) The bishop of Rome representative of the Almighty on earth. (2) The pope and the priesthood constitute the visible church. (3) Territorial fixity and material endowments belong to the outward body of the church. (4) The title of the church to its possessions, however obtained, indefeasible. (5) The pope the ultimate judge in religious matters. (6) The pope the sole dispenser of temporal honors. (7) The pope the supreme criminal judge even of princes. (8) The pope the sole guardian of the faith, to repress and exterminate gainsayers.[1]

V. DECLINE OF THE PAPAL POWER.

LITERATURE: Greenwood, Vol. VI., pp. 277–560; Milman, Vol. VI. and VII.; Creighton, "Hist. of the Papacy during the Reformation," Vol. I. and II.; Alzog, Sec. 226, 227, 265–272; Gieseler, Vol. III., pp. 1–100, 215–289 (very valuable); Schmidt, "*Päpstl. Urkunden und Regesta aus den Jahren 1295–1352*"; Potthast, "*Regesta Pontificum*"; Rietzler, "*Die liter. Widersacher d. Päpste zur Zeit Ludwig des Baiers*"; Lechler, "*Der Kirchenstaat und die Opposition gegen den päpstl. Absolutismus im Anfang d. XIV. Jahrh.*"; Souchon, "*Die Papstwahlen von Bonif. VIII. bis Urban VI.*"; Gregorovius, "*Gesch. d. Stadt Rom,*" *Bd.* V. (also Eng. trans.); Wattenbach, "*Gesch. d. röm. Papstthums*"; Geffcken, "Church and State"; and encyclopedia articles on the various popes, councils, etc.

1. *Causes of the Decline.*

In general it may be said that most of the factors that entered into the growth of the papal power afterward cooperated in working its overthrow. The papacy under

---

[1] Greenwood, Vol. VI., p. 3, *seq.*

Innocent III. overreached itself. The irresponsible authority that he was able temporarily to exercise by reason of personal power and highly favorable circumstances, could by no possibility have been maintained. Frederick II. resisted the successors of Innocent in the most determined way, and called upon the princes of Europe to join him in overthrowing the intolerable tyranny of the papacy. We may particularize as follows:

(1) The Crusades that had done so much for the papacy were influential in its overthrow. The crusading enthusiasm had entirely subsided by the close of the thirteenth century. Yet the successors of Innocent III. continued in season and out of season to press for new crusades, to the disgust of princes and people. The liberalizing effects of the Crusades made them strongly averse to the maintenance of papal absolutism, as did also the growth of commercial and manufacturing enterprise, the growth of great municipalities, the consolidation of the States of Europe, etc., which were due in part to the Crusades.

(2) The rigid enforcement of uniformity in doctrine and practice by the Inquisition and other means proved so oppressive, that dissent, heretofore latent and unaggressive, was forced into publicity and powerfully stimulated. It is noticeable that just as the church reached the highest point of exaltation dissent manifested itself almost everywhere and soon a large proportion of the population was in open revolt.

(3) The vast increase in the machinery of the church brought about by the introduction of the legatine power, by the Crusades and the Inquisition, by the universal judicial authority claimed and exercised, by the wars of the popes in defending the Patrimony of Peter, by the introduction of luxurious living into the Roman Curia, necessitated the raising of immense revenues and led to the devising of the most unscrupulous and oppressive methods of getting money: *Annates* or first fruits (the first year's revenues) were exacted of bishops and abbots, and in order to make occasions for extorting annates as frequent as possible *Collation* from one bishopric to another was frequently resorted to. Thus a single vacancy might be made an occasion for several changes,

each furnishing opportunity for the exaction of annates. Some of the richest benefices in each country were reserved by the popes (*Reservations*) for their own use and that of the cardinals and other favorites. Vast revenues were thus drawn, without any compensating service. Not only were vacant benefices sold to the highest bidder, but *Expectancies* were sold as well. The same expectancy was often sold to a number of applicants, and when the vacancy occurred the claimant that would bid highest was likely to carry the day. *Indulgences*, which had previously been given for going on crusades, were now shamelessly sold. Canon law having put burdensome restrictions upon almost every relation of life, *Dispensations* for the violation of these restrictions were readily granted for money. It became a leading aim with the popes to enrich their relations, especially their illegitimate children. Hence *Nepotism* was practised in such a way as to scandalize Christendom. It came to be said, even by faithful Catholics, that in the Roman Curia everything could be had for money.

(4) The enforcement of celibacy on the clergy and the vast increase of the number and the membership of monastic orders, in the absence of any proper ethical principles, led to an appalling increase in immorality. The most horrible licentiousness became widely prevalent and the moral influence of clergy and monks was highly corrupting.

(5) The papacy became more and more an object of ambition. The cardinals restricted the choice to their own number. Bitter factions were developed among them. Weeks and sometimes months elapsed before an election could be reached and frequently rival popes were elected by rival factions. It became a common practice of the cardinals to elect the oldest and most infirm of their number as pope, so that the next election might not be unduly delayed. Thus the papal government became weak and contemptible.

(6) After the fall of the Hohenstaufens (1254) the German emperors for some time neglected their sovereignty in Italy and Sicily. What might have seemed a victory for the papacy proved the reverse. The French influence became more and more dominant. The policy of

the French kings was to strengthen their hold upon Italy and Sicily by securing a preponderance of Frenchmen in the college of cardinals. The Babylonish captivity of the church was the result of this policy.

2. *Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair (1294–1303).*

(1) Boniface having secured the abdication of Cœlestine V., a weak-minded old hermit who had been appointed by virtue of a compromise between two factions, on his assumption of the pontificate found the Roman Curia banished from Rome and the papal power in a state of degradation. In fact the whole of Europe was in a very unsettled condition at the time. He was a man of considerable learning and unbounded arrogance, and he made a determined but foolhardy attempt to play the part of Innocent III. At his coronation a king held each of his stirrups and the ceremony was of the most imposing character. He attempted to appoint a king of Sicily who was to accept the kingdom as a fief from the Holy See; but the people chose a king for themselves in defiance of the pope. Boniface tried excommunication, interdicts, etc., but the time for such things had passed and they fell flat. He was soon carrying on a war with the Colonna family, two of whom were cardinals, and succeeded in banishing its principal members. He busied himself with overthrowing the Ghibellines in Italy and advancing the interests of the Guelfs.

His most famous struggle was that with Philip the Fair, of France. France and England were at war. The pope commanded them to make peace. They refused. Philip levied a heavy tax on the French clergy. Many of them were unwilling to submit and appealed to the pope. Boniface forbade Philip's taxing the clergy and threatened excommunication, interdicts, etc. Philip retaliated by forbidding the exportation of gold, silver, and precious stones, thus cutting off the papal revenue from France. Boniface was compelled to withdraw his extravagant statements, or to put so mild an interpretation on them as to make them innocuous; and to appease Philip he canonized his grandfather, Louis IX. The peace arrived at was not permanent. In 1301 the struggle was resumed.

(2) The bull "*Unam Sanctam*" was issued by the pope with the concurrence of a synod to which some French prelates, contrary to the orders of the king, had gone. This document represents the papal claims in their most extravagant form. Philip responded by calling together the three estates of his realm. Boniface was accused by the French nation, including the ecclesiastics, of many crimes, and an appeal was made to a General Council. When about to carry his folly to greater extremes still, he was taken prisoner by the agents of Philip. He was released by a mob, but was imprisoned again by one of the cardinals. Owing to old age and hardships, he died shortly afterward.

The bull "*Unam Sanctam*" purports to be a scriptural proof of the absolute universality of papal dominion. Jer. 1 : 10, "Behold, I have set thee over kingdoms and empires," is his principal text. There being but one faith and one baptism, and the church constituting but one body, there can of necessity be but one head. The invisible head is Jesus Christ; the visible, his representatives, the successors to Peter. Christ has established two swords or powers in the church—the one temporal, the other spiritual. The latter he has committed to the priesthood, the former to kings; and both being in the church, both have the same end. The temporal power being inferior, is subject to the spiritual, which is the higher and more noble, and directs the former as the soul does the body. Should the temporal power turn aside from its prescribed course, it is the duty of the spiritual to recall it to its true destiny. It is of the faith that all men, even kings, are subject to the pope; for if kings were not subject to the censures of the church whenever they might sin in the exercise of the power committed to them, they would as a consequence be out of the church, and the two powers would be essentially distinct, having, in this case, their origins in two different and opposite principles, an error not far removed from the heresy of the Manichæans.

(3) Boniface's arrogant assertion of papal supremacy not only called forth in France the assertion of the liberties of France and of the Gallican church, but was the occasion of a remarkable defense of the empire, that the popes had almost destroyed, by Dante, the great poet of the Middle Ages. In his treatise on Monarchy ("*De Monarchia*") he insisted that the empire derived its existence and its rights immediately from God and by no means from the church, that it existed before the church, that Christ sanctioned it by being born in it, and still further by submitting to condemnation and death at its

hands, that he gave to the church no authority over the empire, that the empire is necessary to the well-being of mankind, the end of society being unity and unity being possible only through obedience to one head. This was followed by a number of other defenses of civil government over against papal absolutism. Egidius, of Rome, published a disputation in which the arguments for and against the papal power are set forth, the advantage being given to the latter. John, a Dominican monk of Paris, published a treatise on "The Royal and the Papal Power."[1]

3. *The Babylonish Captivity of the Church* (*1305–1376*).

After the death of Boniface and a pontificate of less than a year by his successor, Philip secured the appointment of Clement V., who seems to have made a secret pledge to remove the papal court to France, to annul the proceedings of Boniface, to anathematize Boniface, and (probably) to destroy the Templars. A period of terrible corruption ensued. Nothing did so much to weaken the papacy as the papal residence at Avignon. The luxury of the papal court went far beyond anything that had been known in the past. Every known way of raising money was resorted to. Venality, mendacity, and licentiousness abounded. The spirit of resistance to papal absolutism that had long ago begun to manifest itself now became well-nigh universal. The removal of the papal court to Avignon weakened the papacy in the following ways:

(1) By the manifest subserviency of the papacy to French interests other nations were alienated.

(2) The shameless immorality of the papal court destroyed respect for the hierarchy and caused a general demand for reform.

(3) Every known way of raising money was carried to its extreme development, and the intolerableness of the burden came to be generally felt throughout Europe. The conviction grew that the people were being imposed upon. The French government itself and the University of Paris soon became utterly disgusted with the

---

[1] These two writings are available in Goldast, "*Monarchia S. Romani Imperii*," Vol. III.

Avignon court and were among the most persistent advocates of reform. Germany, England, and Bohemia, one after another, revolted from papal domination. The pope was declared by theologians, jurists, and poets to be unworthy of confidence. Many regarded him as antichrist. We can only refer at present to the great revolt in Germany under Louis the Bavarian, that in England with which the name of Wycliffe is so closely associated, and that in Bohemia connected with the name of Huss. In all of these countries there grew up an extensive vernacular literature in which the vices of clergy and monks, high and low, were mercilessly ridiculed or scathingly condemned. These anti-papal movements will come up for fuller consideration in a later chapter.

(4) Each pope during this period was compelled as a condition of his election to promise to restore the papal court to Rome, but each found some excuse for violating his oath. The perfidy of the popes intensified the conviction that they were antichrist.

(5) The destruction of the Templars and the confiscation of their estates was an unpopular movement and did much to weaken the papal cause.

(6) Prophetesses, like Brigitta and Catherine of Siena, denounced the divine judgment upon the Avignon papacy and enthusiastically urged the return of the papal court to Rome.

The details of papal history during this period must be omitted in the interest of brevity. The destruction of the Templars, a military order that had acquired great wealth and influence in France, and that had awakened both the jealousy and the cupidity of the king, seems to have been due to a secret understanding between pope and king. A criminal offered to testify, as the price of his liberation, that he had been informed by a member of the order, a fellow-prisoner, that the Templars were guilty of blasphemy, sacrilege, and of every conceivable abomination (spitting on the crucifix and trampling it under foot, worshiping a hideous idol, denying the existence of God, practising unnatural lust, broiling their illegitimate children, etc.). There is no reason to suppose that the specific charges on which they were condemned were true, or that their moral and religious principles were worse than those that prevailed in the papal court. Some of the Templars, under torture, were induced to admit the charges; but their condemnation was a foregone conclusion. The Council of Vienna (1311–1312) consented to the suppression of the order as a matter of expediency.

John XXII. (1316–1334), whose struggle with Louis the Bavarian will be dealt with in another chapter, was accused of heresy by the Dominican theologians and the University of Paris, for asserting that departed souls could not enjoy the intuitive vision of God until after the general judgment and the resurrection of the body. He recanted on his death-bed. He accumulated eighteen millions of gold florins and seven millions' worth of jewels, the chief sources of revenue having been annates, expectancies, and tithes. Some of the Franciscans asserted that Christ and his apostles practised poverty, having no possessions either as individuals or in common. The Dominicans declared this assertion heresy and were supported by the pope. The Franciscans declared the pope a heretic. William of Occam, one of the greatest thinkers of the Middle Ages, and Michael of Cesena, general of the Franciscans, defended the Franciscan position, and wrote strongly against the pope's claim of temporal power and of infallibility in doctrine, and insisted that a general council is the highest earthly tribunal. By 1352 France had become so turmoiled and weakened by war with England that the popes no longer found advantage in residence at Avignon. Urban V. was removed to Rome in 1367, but the city was in ruins and Italy in an unsettled condition. He returned to Avignon in 1370.

The States of the Church having been reduced to obedience, Gregory XI. took up his residence in Rome (1377), but he found himself beset with difficulties and died soon afterward (1378).

4. *The Papal Schism (1378–1439).*

The papal schism, occasioned by persistent efforts on the part of the Italians and others to secure the restoration of the papal court to Rome, was a source of still greater scandal than the captivity, and utterly confused Christendom. During part of the time France, Scotland, Savoy, Lorraine, Castile, Aragon, and Naples adhered to one pope, while Germany, England, Denmark, Poland, Prussia, and the rest of Italy, adhered to another. The spectacle of two popes (sometimes three) excommunicating and anathematizing each other was by no means edifying. The disaffection that had long been manifesting itself in England and Bohemia broke out into open schism during this period.

After the death of Gregory XI. the utmost solicitude was felt by the Roman people lest his successor should forsake the city. Of the sixteen cardinals at that time in Rome eleven were French. The French cardinals were known to be disgusted with the squalor and the barbarism of Rome. United they could easily have elected a Frenchman pledged to return to Avignon. The mob without the conclave shouted unceasingly: "We want a Roman pope, or at least an Italian." While awaiting the result, they broke into the papal wine cellars, and their enthusiasm for a Roman pope was thereby mightily increased. The archbishop of Bari (not a Roman) was elected, but the cardinals feared to face the mob. At last some one falsely reported that the cardinal of St. Peter's was pope and the cardinals made good their escape. The anger of the mob on learning of the deception was such that they were ready to tear the pope-elect to pieces, but after a few days quiet was restored and he was duly crowned as Urban VI., April, 1378.

Within a few weeks a majority of the cardinals, who had retired to Anagni, having gained political and military backing, renounced Urban VI. as having been elected under the pressure of a Roman mob, and in September elected Robert of Geneva as Clement VII., who made Avignon his capital. Thus was precipitated the great schism that was to last for sixty years, notwithstanding the most earnest and persistent efforts of princes and clergy to reconcile the factions and to restore unity to the administration of ecclesiastical affairs.

5. *Efforts to Heal the Schism (1394–1409).*

The papal schism became so distressing to the nations of Europe that concerted measures for the restoration of unity were earnestly considered. Among the first to move in favor of a general council was the University of Paris. The theologians of the Sorbonne had just triumphed in a controversy with the Dominicans, supported by Pope Clement VII., on the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, Dominicans and pope denying. In 1394 Nicolas de Clemangis presented to the king on behalf of the Sorbonne a plan of reformation. It provided that both popes should resign; that arbitrators should be appointed by both popes; and that a general council should be convoked by the king, which by its own authority should put an end to the existing state of things. Clement died shortly afterward. Notwithstanding the king's injunction to abstain from an election, the Avignon cardinals proceeded to elect Benedict XIII., one of the ablest and most upright of their number. He had professed a willingness to abdicate in case the interests of the church should require this action. The king was enraged and called a national synod to deal with the matter; but the synod made the mistake of recognizing Benedict *ad interim*. Public calamities occurring about this time had made the king willing to be rid of the papacy.

The University of Paris joined with the king in his efforts to compel Benedict to resign, but he was obstinate, defying all the authorities arrayed against him. The king of Castile and the University of Toulouse came to his support. He even succeeded in attaching to himself such reformers as Nicolas de Clemangis and Peter d'Ailly of the University of Paris. The retirement of these great leaders to enter the papal service enhanced the violence of the opposition to Benedict in the university. It was now proposed that the pope be declared guilty of heresy and mortal sin in refusing to abdicate, that the cardinals renounce obedience to him, that his censures be unheeded, and that he be compelled by a general council to abdicate. John Gerson, the greatest of the Paris theologians, counseled milder measures, but when Benedict interfered with the university an appeal was made to a future pope who should be "one, true, orthodox. and universal." By 1397 England, Germany, and Spain were ready to join with France in a determined effort to heal the schism. Benedict continued defiant and the allegiance of France was withdrawn from him (1398). He was besieged in Avignon, September, 1398–April, 1399, and imprisoned from the latter date to March, 1403, when by reason of a popular reaction in his favor he was able to escape. Two months later the cardinals induced the king to restore to Benedict the allegiance of France, but fresh difficulties soon arose.

In Rome a somewhat similar war was waged between Boniface IX. and the German emperor, Wenzel, in which the pope was victorious. Boniface was one of the most avaricious of the popes and made the most unscrupulous use of all available means for gaining wealth. When asked on his deathbed how he was, he answered: "If I had more money, I should be well enough." It was hoped that his death (1404) would facilitate the healing of the schism, but amid the wildest confusion such cardinals as could get together proceeded to elect a successor as Innocent VII.

Gregory XII., who had succeeded Innocent VII. as Roman pope (1406), professed a consuming zeal for papal unity. He would go in a fishing-boat or on foot, if necessary, to confer with his rival. In a letter to Benedict he besought his co-operation in "bringing health to the church that has been so long diseased." To this end he would resign, if Benedict would. The University of Paris was again urging that France should renounce Benedict. A synod assembled for the consideration of this demand (November, 1406–January, 1407) decided to leave to him his spiritual dignity, but to deprive him of his revenues. In this action the king joined. Gregory's pacific utterances caused much rejoicing in France. Benedict professed also a desire for the restoration of unity, but only "by way of justice." Negotiations between the two popes during this and the following years were fruitless. Each longed for unity, with himself at the head; neither could be persuaded that the interests of the church required his abdication.

[illegible]

6. *The Reforming Councils (1409–1443).*

In 1408 both popes found themselves in a forsaken and desperate situation. Four cardinals of each met at Livorno and agreed to re-establish the unity of the church by a general council. Those who had been at-

Council came from I. S[illegible]

tached to Gregory issued a letter calling upon the faithful to withdraw from him obedience and financial support. A like exhortation was sent forth by Benedict's cardinals. Both bodies of cardinals united in calling a general council to meet at Pisa, May 29, 1409.

(1) *The Council of Pisa* (1409). This council was called under the protection of Charles VI. of France. Two sets of cardinals, representing Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII., were present. Every effort had been made by the cardinals and the princes of Europe to make the body really ecumenical. There assembled twenty-two cardinals, the Latin patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, twelve archbishops in person and fourteen by proxy, eighty bishops in person and one hundred and two by proxy, eighty-seven abbots in person and two hundred by proxy, a large number of priors and generals of orders, deputies of the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Florence, Cracow, Vienna, Prague, etc., more than three hundred doctors in theology, ambassadors from the kings of England, France, Portugal, Bohemia, Sicily, Poland, Cyprus, Brabant, Burgundy, etc.

The rival popes were summoned and, not appearing, were declared contumacious by a sentence affixed to the church door. After much negotiation and controversy both sets of cardinals were induced to abandon their allegiance to their respective popes. Both popes were declared to be "schismatical, abettors of schism, heretics, and guilty of perjury," and were deposed and excommunicated.

The cardinals were compelled to promise, each for himself, that if elected pope he would continue the council until the church should be reformed in its head and members, and they were shut up and kept under guard until an election should take place. The aged and feeble cardinal of Milan was appointed and assumed the name Alexander V.

Notwithstanding the apparent strength of the council, the schism was not healed. There were now three popes instead of two, who persisted in heaping upon each other the most terrific anathemas. Benedict (at Avignon) was acknowledged by Spain, Portugal, and Scotland; Gregory (at Rome) by Naples, Hungary, and parts of Germany;

while Alexander was supported by France, England, and other parts of Germany.

Alexander V. died the following year and was succeeded by John XXIII., one of the most infamous of men.

(2) *The Council of Constance* (1414–1418). The aim of this council was to heal the schism, to condemn and 2 suppress heresy ~~(especially that of Huss in~~ Bohemia), and 3 to reform the church in its head and members. It was called by John XXIII., and was the most numerously attended council of the Middle Ages; eighteen thousand clergy are said to have been present, and one hundred and fifty thousand people, many of whom were mountebanks, strolling actors, money lenders, and prostitutes, are said to have thronged the city at one time. These numbers are probably exaggerated, but the attendance was certainly immense. The retinue and luggage of the pope were conveyed by sixteen hundred horses, those of the emperor by one thousand. John had intended to control the council by packing it with Italians. To obviate this it was arranged to have the voting by nations. Thus the German, French, and English, being united in main points, were able to overbear the papal influence. John was accused of the most immoral and atrocious conduct, of the most abominable heresy (infidelity, swearing by the devil), etc. He was deposed and deprived, though afterward he was appointed cardinal bishop. The claims of the other popes were repudiated. The doctrine which had already been elaborated by John Gerson and Peter d'Ailly that the church universal assembled in council is the highest ecclesiastical tribunal on earth, and that to such a court it belongs to depose unworthy popes and to do anything necessary for the well-being of the church, was clearly enunciated and was put into practice. The burning of John Huss and of Jerome of Prague by the council will be considered in another chapter.

In November, 1417, the cardinals, under the direction of the council, appointed Cardinal Otho Colonna pope, who was crowned as Martin V. The new pope, with the help of the officials of the Roman Curia, busied himself at once with editing the rules of the papal chancery. The extortionate methods of raising money that were in vogue (including the exaction of annates, the reservation of the chief dignities in cathedral, collegiate, and conventual churches, and the sale of expectancies, dispensations, indulgences, etc.) were confirmed.

After concordats, fixing the relations between the church and the various nations, had been drawn up and confirmed, the council was adjourned in April, 1418. The pope had promised to carry forward the work of reformation; but it had become well understood that he had no sympathy with the Gallican idea of the relation of popes and general councils, and that he was determined to insist upon papal prerogative as it had been established by Gregory VII. and Innocent III. A few weeks after the adjournment of the council he declared that it was "unlawful for any one either to appeal from the judgments of the Apostolic See, or to reject its decisions in matters of faith."

The council of Constance virtually put an end to the schism, though Benedict XIII. continued till his death (1424) to claim the papal dignity and to anathematize all but his handful of followers. In 1425 three of Benedict's cardinals elected a new pope, who called himself Clement VIII. Another of these cardinals, who was absent at the time of the election, took the responsibility of electing another pope as Benedict XIV. The former was supported for a time by Alfonso V. of Aragon, but abandoned his pretensions in 1429.

Martin V. had promised to convoke a council at an early date for the further reformation of the church. In response to an invitation (which he privately neutralized) a few bishops, etc., assembled at Pavia (1423) and afterward at Siena; but nothing was accomplished. Shortly before his death, in view of the great Hussite schism, he was induced to call a council to meet at Basel.

(3) *The Council of Basel* (1431–1449). A crusade against the Hussites (1427) had completely failed and the Bohemians were raiding Germany (1430). The Hussites insisted that they were true Catholics and demanded that the points at issue between themselves and the papal church be adjudicated in a general council. The pressure for a council became so great by 1431 that Martin felt it unwise longer to defer its convocation. The council was formally opened under the authority of Eugenius IV. (July 1431), who had succeeded Martin in February. A last attempt at subjugating the Hussites, attended by fearful slaughter and devastation, was still

[illegible] fail? — Why? [illegible]

in progress. It resulted in the disastrous defeat of the crusaders. The news of the disaster produced a deep impression upon the assembly. A letter was addressed to the Bohemians inviting them to join with the council in restoring the unity of the church and offering safe-conduct to their representatives. "Send, we beseech you, men in whom you trust the Spirit of the Lord rests, gentle, God-fearing, humble, desirous of peace, seeking not their own but the things of Christ, whom we pray to give to us and to you and all Christian people peace on earth, and in the world to come life everlasting."

This letter was probably drafted by Cardinal Cesarini, who had led the last crusade and was deeply concerned for the restoration of church unity. Eugenius was fearful lest in their anxiety to conciliate the Bohemians the council should compromise the papal dignity and authority. He issued a bull dissolving the council (Nov., 1431). The council refused to accept the bull and Cesarini wrote the pope a letter of earnest remonstrance. He pointed out that the morals of the German clergy were such that if not amended the people would rise up against them as the Hussites were doing. "Even if the Bohemian heresy were extinguished, another would rise up in its place." To refuse to meet the Bohemians, now that they had been invited, would be as disgraceful as the flight of the German army had been. "If we do not let this council alone, we shall lose our temporalities, and our lives and souls as well."

The Emperor Sigismund tried in vain to induce the pope to withdraw his bull of dissolution. Only when he saw that the council, with Sigismund's support, were determined to go forward and that his own deposition was imminent, did the pope at last consent to permit the body to proceed with its work (Feb., 1433). Before the arrival of the pope's legates the council passed a decree in favor of decennial councils,—as the council of Constance had done,—declaring the right of a council to reassemble without papal authority, and making suspension and deprivation the penalties of an attempt by a pope to impede or prorogue a council. On the arrival of the papal legates the right of sharing in the presidency was refused them.

Eugenius was driven from Rome in 1434 and the council proceeded with its reformatory measures and its negotiations with the Hussites. The renewal of negotiations with the Greeks, who were being sorely pressed by the

Turks and felt the need of the aid of Western Christendom (1433), greatly complicated the situation. Eugenius was anxious to bring about the removal of the council from Basel, in the hope that thereby he might regain control. He arranged to bring to Italy the Greek emperor and a large number of Greek prelates at the expense of the council. Basel was not sufficiently accessible for the purpose. As a compromise the council chose Avignon as the place for meeting the Greeks. In 1437 the council suffered schism, about seventy members stubbornly insisting, with the pope, on an Italian location, and about two hundred adhering to Avignon, notwithstanding the protest of the Greeks.

The pope recognized the minority as the true council and ratified their choice of Florence or Udine. The majority summoned the pope to Basel, and on his failure to appear declared him contumacious. The pope pronounced the council dissolved. Both parties sent embassies and galleys for the Greeks, who after some hesitation committed themselves to the papal party.

The Emperor Sigismund tried in vain to heal the breach between pope and council ; for he was deeply interested in the pacification of Bohemia as a means of securing recognition for himself as king. Sigismund's death (Dec., 1437) left the council free to proceed against the pope. The remnant of the council, now supported by the king of Aragon and the dukes of Milan and Savoy, suspended the pope (Jan., 1438). Most of the other leading rulers protested.

Early in 1438 the papal party assembled a council at Ferrara (transferred to Florence, Jan., 1439) to confer with the emperor, the patriarch, and several bishops of the Greeks. The doctrines of purgatory, the procession of the Holy Ghost, the supremacy of the pope, and the use of unleavened bread, were elaborately discussed. The Greeks finally accepted the Latin views on the points in dispute, including the supremacy of the pope. But the sentiment in the East was so bitterly and uncompromisingly opposed to the measure that it was speedily abandoned. In 1443 the patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria issued an encyclical in which they denounced the council of Florence as a "council of robbers," and the patriarch of Constantinople as "a matricide and a heretic." The fall of Constantinople ten years later put an end to attempts at union.

In July, 1436, legates of the council, with the Emperor Sigismund, met the Bohemian envoys at Iglau, and the *Compactata*, the terms of which had previously been agreed upon, was signed. It provided for communion under both kinds (bread and wine), the use of means for the reformation of the lives of the clergy, a certain amount of freedom of preaching, and the removal of some grievances regarding the holding and administration of church property. Thus the council condescended to treat on equal terms with heretics and to grant special privileges to those that had openly defied the authority of the church.

A number of reformatory measures were adopted by the council, including prohibition of clerical concubinage, abuse of appeals to the Roman Curia and of interdicts, collection of annates, and sacrilegious disorders in connection with ecclesiastical feasts. It prescribed the mode of electing popes and the qualifications of candidates for the pontificate and sought to legislate for the reformation of the Roman Curia.

In May, 1438, a national French synod at Bourges, called by Charles VII., adopted the reformatory decrees of the council (Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges) and thus France virtually declared against Eugenius and in favor of the council. Germany had already declared her neutrality, which meant the repudiation of the authority of the pope.

In May, 1439, the council declared Eugenius guilty of heresy for denying that a general council has power over a pope and for attempting to dissolve a general council lawfully constituted, and in June deposed him from his office. In October electors were nominated for the appointment of a new pope. The choice fell upon Amadeus VIII., duke of Savoy, who by reason of his wealth and connections was a man of weight. A few years before he had retired from active life and with seven companions was living in religious seclusion. The electors represented equally France, Italy, Germany, and Spain. The new pope assumed the name Felix V., and the council (Feb., 1440) commanded all men everywhere on pain of excommunication to obey him. In July he entered Basel, accompanied by his two sons and the Savoyard nobility, and was crowned pope in the presence of fifty thousand spectators. Felix failed to secure the hoped-for recognition of the great powers. He had been elected in part because of his wealth, but he demanded that the council should make financial provision for the support of his court, and it was obliged to resort to methods of raising money that it had solemnly condemned. Having made every effort to gain the adherence of Frederick III., the new German emperor, and finding his relations with the council unsatisfactory, he retired to Lausanne in 1443. Thenceforth the council was a vanishing quantity.

By bribery and bargaining, conducted chiefly through Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, one of the most astute ecclesiastical politicians of the age (afterward to become Pope Pius II., 1458), Germany was won to the support of Eugenius and his successor, Nicolas V. (1447–1453). The Concordat of Vienna (1448) was the fruit of these negotiations. It was a provisional arrangement between pope and emperor, which somewhat limited the scope of papal reservations and provisions (benefices, except the chief positions in cathedrals and collegiate churches, falling vacant in alternate months were to be at the pope's disposal), but allowed the collection of annates and the papal confirmation of elections. The advantages of this concordat were wholly on the side of the pope.

Nicolas was disposed to be conciliatory and was willing to treat with kindly consideration the remnant of the council of Basel and the anti-pope. Felix V. abdicated (April, 1449) and was promptly admitted into the College of Cardinals. The council of Basel elected Nicolas V. pope and dissolved. Nicolas restored to the cardinalate d'Allemand, who for some years had been leader of the council, and accepted three of the cardinals who had been created by Felix. Thus the schism was healed. It was the good fortune of Nicolas also to aid materially in the pacification of Italy and especially in the restoration of order in the Papal States. The papacy had lost much of prestige through the captivity and the schism, but it had at last triumphed over the opponents of its high prerogatives and was prepared to enter afresh upon a career of irresponsibility and self-aggrandizement. The last state of this great institution was to prove worse than the first.

In 1452 Frederick III. visited Rome, took the oath of obedience to the pope, was made a canon of St. Peter's, and was solemnly crowned emperor of the Romans. Many special immunities and privileges were conferred upon the emperor in consideration of his subservient attitude.[1] Yet Frederick failed to secure the support of the Austrian and German estates and the pope shared in his humiliation.

The fall of Constantinople (1453) led Nicolas to preach a crusade against the Turks. He was persuaded by Æneas Sylvius that a successful crusade under papal guidance would be the crowning glory of his reign; but the princes of Europe were too much occupied with their own affairs to give heed to the call.

He devoted much attention to the restoration of the architecture and fortifications of Rome and the Papal States. Among his architectural achievements are the Vatican palace and the basilica of St. Peter's. The Vatican library was his creation. His architectural plans were sufficiently numerous and expensive to have occupied several pontificates. He died in 1453, after having launched the papacy on a career of extravagance in architectural and artistic enterprise.

Calixtus III. (1453–1458) owed his election to his age and feebleness. He declared war against the Turks and sent a fleet against them; but he was unable to arouse Europe to crusading fury. He devoted much attention to the promotion of his near relatives. Two of his "nephews" (Borgias) he made cardinals, a third he made prefect of Rome, etc. Æneas Sylvius, who had been chief agent of Nicolas V. in Germany and Austria, became cardinal under Calixtus and joined hands with the Borgias in their schemes for self-aggrandizement.

VII. THE POPES OF THE RENAISSANCE.

LITERATURE: Creighton, "A Hist. of the Papacy During the Period of the Reformation," Vol. II., p. 233, *seq.*, Vols. III., IV. (this is by far the best work in English, if not in any language. It is based upon a masterly use of the sources); Pastor, "*Gesch. d. Päpste*," *Bd.* I. (also Eng. trans.); Gregorovius, "*Gesch. d. Stadt Rom*," *Bd.* VII. and VIII. (also Eng. trans.); Hefele, "*Conciliengeschichte*," *Bd.* VIII. (written by Hergenröther), 1887; Voigt, "*Enea Silvius de' Piccolomini als Papst Pius II.*"; Gebhardt, "*Die Gravamina der deutschen Nation*," 1884; Symonds, "The Age of the Despots"; Ranke, "*Die römischen Päpste in den letzten vier Jahrh.*," sixth ed., 1874 (Eng. trans. of earlier ed.); Roscoe, "The Life and Pontificate of Leo X." For excellent sketches of the various popes, with ample bibliographies, see latest ed. of the Herzog-Hauck "*Real-Encyklopädie*" (the third ed. is in progress and six vols. have appeared to August, 1899).

---

[1] See Creighton, Vol. II., p. 299, *seq.*

1. *Pius II.* (1458–1464) was a diplomatist and a statesman of the Machiavellian type. He had taken a leading part in the council of Basel and for a time served Felix V. as secretary. He was noted for his elegant Latinity and for his poetical gifts no less than for his agreeableness of manners and his astuteness as a man of affairs. His life was most careless and self-indulgent. In 1442, with Felix's consent, he became secretary to the Emperor Frederick III. In 1443 he was won to the service of Eugenius IV. and devoted some years to attempts at conciliating pope and emperor. Nicolas V. bestowed upon him two bishoprics and Calixtus III. made him cardinal. By shrewd management he was elected pope over a strong French candidate. As Pius II. he was ambitious to raise the papacy to its former grandeur and he believed that a successful crusade against the Turks was the most effective means to this end. He founded a new order of knights, the Hospital Order of St. Mary of Bethlehem, and called together at Mantua (1459–1460) a council of princes to arrange for a powerful expedition against the Turks.

The effort was a failure. He took occasion at Mantua to denounce appeals from a pope to a general council. Several appeals were soon afterward made. He sent Cardinal Bessarion to Germany to labor for a crusade; but a fresh body of grievances was the result. His own liberal attitude in the council of Basel was constantly quoted against him when he undertook to insist upon papal prerogative. He felt obliged afterward in a bull of retractations to apologize for the errors into which as a youth he had fallen; but he rather weakened than strengthened his cause thereby. He attempted by a letter to convert the sultan to Christianity. When he announced his determination to lead a crusade in person and offered the usual plenary indulgences and immunities to those who would join him, only the rabble responded. He died just as he was about to embark.

From this time onward to the Protestant revolution the College of Cardinals showed their utter disregard of religious principles and even of common decency by appointing to the papacy some of the most depraved of their number and making for themselves the best terms possible at each election. Luxury and license, murder and rapine, abounded. The Turkish war and the completion of St. Peter's furnished pretexts for the extorting of extraordinary taxes from Christendom.

2. *Sixtus IV.* (1471–1484) was chiefly intent on exalting and enriching his humble family. To this end he stirred up strife among the Italian republics and brought the papacy into general contempt.

3. *Innocent VIII.* (1484–1492), though he had promised the cardinals that he would not promote more than one of his relatives to the cardinalate and that he would employ no layman in administrative matters, proceeded at once to use his position for the advancement of his seven illegitimate children, whom he openly acknowledged. He multiplied the offices of the Roman Curia and sold them for large sums, spent much money on architecture, and bestowed considerable patronage on the new learning. He was amiable, but unscrupulous and without political ability. In the last year of his reign the Moors were driven from Grenada, their last stronghold in Spain, and Columbus discovered the new world. Savonarola was just beginning his wonderful career as preacher and prophet in Florence. Lorenzo de' Medici, the great promoter of the new learning, died the same year with Innocent. The immorality of Rome, already appalling, was made still more flagrant by the pope's entertainment of his illegitimate children in the Vatican.

4. *Alexander VI.* (1492–1503). Roderigo Borgia was over sixty years of age when he was made pope, and he had been a cardinal thirty-six years. He had combined business shrewdness with matchless opportunities, and was the richest of the cardinals. Besides a number of children of whose mother (or mothers) nothing is known, he had a family of four children by a Roman woman with whom he lived somewhat regularly. He was regarded as a genial, kindly man, and beyond his affection for his family and his efforts for their promotion, there seemed no reason why he should not make a satisfactory pope. In fact, great things were expected of him. It soon ap-

peared that he was capable of any crime that the interests of himself or his children seemed to require. He entered at once on a series of intrigues with the Italian princes, the king of France, the emperor, the king of Spain, and the sultan. He made his eldest son Juan, duke of Gandia, and bestowed upon him the duchy of Benevento, which belonged to the States of the Church. He caused a combination of the emperor, the king of Spain, the doge of Venice, and the duke of Milan against Charles VIII. of France, whom he had first opposed and then aided in his efforts to conquer Naples. The exclusion of the French from Italy left Alexander and his son Cæsar Borgia to work their will upon the minor rulers. Cæsar, whom he made cardinal, usurped the administration of the States of the Church, causing the imprisonment, assassination, or poisoning, of any that stood in his way. Of the cardinals that had opposed Alexander's election some were murdered, some imprisoned, and others fled from the city. Cæsar was suspected of causing the death of his brother Juan, to whose estates he succeeded. In 1498 Alexander made a treaty with Louis XII. of France, who made Cæsar Borgia a duke and gave him a French princess in marriage. The pope added to Cæsar's possessions and dignities the principality of Romagna.

The marriages, divorces, and intrigues or Lucretia Borgia, the pope's daughter, were equally scandalous. Contemporary Catholic writers have perpetuated the current suspicion that she was criminally intimate with the pope himself. So shocking were the crimes of these three that nothing was supposed to be too monstrous for either of them to do. Lucretia's later life as the wife of Alfonso of Ferrara seems to have been free from scandal and it is probable that in her earlier irregularities she was more sinned against than sinning. That Alexander was a monster of iniquity Roman Catholic writers, contemporary and recent, agree in admitting; that he was the most depraved of all popes is not so certain.

5. *Julius II.* (1503–1513) held Alexander and Cæsar Borgia in utmost abhorrence. The latter fled from Italy and died in the military service of his brother-in-law, the king of Navarre. Julius professed a determination to reform the Roman Curia and issued a decree against simony; but he soon became involved in war for the restoration of the States of the Church. He formed an

alliance with the king of France and the emperor to secure the submission of Venice. He then joined with Venice and Spain against France, bestowing on Ferdinand the claim of the French king to Naples. Soon France and the empire were arrayed against the pope (1510) and called a general council at Pisa for the reformation of the church. This council was of no weight, being made up almost exclusively of French prelates.

The pope retaliated by calling an ecumenical Lateran council (1512) and made a firm alliance with Spain, Venice, England, and Switzerland, whereby he was able to drive the French from Italy. The pope died soon after the opening of the council (Feb., 1513).

Julius was the most warlike of all the popes. He could not endure the presence of foreign powers in Italy and he maintained and used great armies in driving them out. He was far more a soldier than an ecclesiastic.

6. *Leo X.* (1513–1521). A member of the Medici family of Florence, he had been made a cardinal in his boyhood and had been brought up in the atmosphere of the Renaissance. He was only thirty-eight years of age, and it was well understood that his inclination would be for peace and splendor. He was reported to have said after his election: "Let us enjoy the papacy, since God has given it to us." His contemporaries smiled when he took the name *Leo*, saying that *Agnus* would suit his character better. He surrounded himself with men of letters and artists, and spent immense sums in literature and art. He was far more interested in the revived paganism of the Renaissance than in Christianity and is said to have regarded the narratives of the origin of Christianity as fabulous. His court was in the highest degree luxurious and licentious. Yet he was alive to the political necessities of the papacy and the opportunity that the office presented for the enrichment and the aggrandizement of his own family. He took a deep interest in foreign politics and made from time to time such alliances as suited his purposes, but he gained his ends by peaceable means, and discouraged war.

The Lateran Council was continued under Leo. In this he refused to deal harshly with the cardinals who were in rebellion in the interests of France or to press for the immediate abolition in France of the Pragmatic Sanction. The council reasserted the papal prerogatives in the spirit of the bull "*Unam Sanctam*" of Boniface VIII., and made some pretense at reform. But most of the reforms were, in the words of a contemporary, "slight, almost futile, not to say puerile." Reformation was as far as possible from the thoughts of Leo and his advisers. The council took note of the rapidly spreading infidelity of the Renaissance and prohibited the teaching of the mortality of the soul in the universities. A decree in favor of the pacification of Europe was unanimously adopted. The intrigues of the pope with various European powers during the next few years cannot be here narrated. In 1516, after he had long schemed in vain for the discomfiture of France, he entered into the most friendly relations with the king. The Pragmatic Sanction was withdrawn and a concordat was signed between pope and king in accordance with which the king was to nominate abbots and bishops, papal reservations were abolished, papal provisions were limited, university graduates were to be appointed to vacant benefices during four months of the year, limitations were put upon appeals to Rome and the exercise by the pope of excommunication and interdict, and concubinary clergy were to be disciplined; the pope retained the right of collecting annates and other ecclesiastical taxes. This arrangement was ratified in the Lateran Council still in session. On March 16, 1517, the Lateran Council was dissolved. On October 31 Luther posted his ninety-five theses and the Protestant Revolution was inaugurated.

CHAPTER III

REACTIONARY AND REFORMING PARTIES

I. PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS

1. THE Paulicians, the "Protestants of the East," continued their struggle against ecclesiastical corruption and oppression in Asia Minor during the present period, and were settled in vast colonies in Thrace and Bulgaria. That their influence throughout eastern Europe should become widespread and pervasive might have been expected. It is certain that it extended to western Europe as well, and in a somewhat corrupted form had much to do with the extensive Catharistic movement.

2. It is highly probable that Manichæan modes of thought, disseminated so aggressively in the fourth and fifth centuries, were perpetuated with greater or less vigor until the eleventh century, when they co-operated with Paulician and other influences in producing the Catharism referred to in the preceding paragraph.

3. It is equally probable that evangelical forms of Christianity survived in greater or less strength and purity during the dark ages that followed the barbarian invasions and that the evangelical parties that appeared in the twelfth and following centuries were consciously or unconsciously influenced by earlier evangelical life. The historical connection of the Paulicianism of the present period with the evangelical life and thought of early post-apostolic Christianity seems well established. The persistence of the older British type of Christianity in England, Wales, and Scotland, even after Hildebrand's vigorous efforts to suppress it, is unquestioned, and the connection of the later Lollardism with this old evangelical doctrine and life is highly probable. From what we know of the persistence of types of religious life and doctrine we have reason to suspect that earlier types persisted to a greater or less extent in almost

every part of Europe; but opportunity and a certain amount of stimulus from without were necessary to bring them into activity and publicity. The rapidity with which evangelical parties spread over Europe and the hearty reception everywhere accorded to evangelical preachers by the masses can be best accounted for by the supposition that latent evangelical life was widely diffused.

4. The persistence of these and other early types of religious thought and life and the action and reaction of these upon each other and upon the dominant form of Christianity, and of this upon them, with the influence of racial and other sociological factors, enables us to account, in a general way, for the multiplex phenomena of dissenting Christian life during the Middle Ages. But in most cases the historical materials are too meager to allow us to determine the precise relations of any particular movement to the past or to determine precisely which of the earlier modes of thought have entered into it and in just what proportions. This is true in a measure even of modern religious movements, where the documentary materials are relatively abundant.

5. It should be remarked that for the history of mediæval dissenting parties we are dependent almost wholly on data preserved by their enemies. By far the largest and most important part of extant information regarding the doctrines and practices of the "heretics" of the period is due to the work of Romish inquisitors. Such representations are necessarily unsympathetic and unfair. Much of the material is due to the confessions of "heretics" under the most excruciating tortures. On the other hand, it was the business of inquisitors to ascertain accurately and to put on record for the guidance of other agents of the Inquisition the peculiar features and all the details of the doctrine and practice of each persecuted party. While allowance must therefore be made for extorted confession of corrupt and abominable practices, we may place considerable confidence in the detailed accounts of doctrine and polity given in the inquisitorial records.

6. Again, we are dependent on inquisitorial records for our knowledge of the numbers and the diffusion of

"heretics." As the work of the Inquisition was by no means uniformly thorough in all parts of Europe, or equally so at all times, and as "heretics" of the various types became exceedingly skillful in evading the officers of the Inquisition, allowing themselves in many cases to conform outwardly to the established church and to use ambiguous language in answering inquisitors, we may be sure that those actually arraigned constituted a very small fraction of what actually existed. It is also certain that the inquisitorial records preserved represent a very small part of the actual inquisitorial proceedings. With these considerations in mind, we can perhaps form some just estimate of the importance of mediæval dissent.

The anti-Romanist Christian life of the Middle Ages may be conveniently classified as follows: (1) Dualistic parties; (2) Pantheistic parties; (3) Chiliastic parties; (4) Evangelical separatists; (5) Churchly reforming parties.

DUALISTIC DISSENT.

LITERATURE: Döllinger, "*Beiträge zur Sektengesch. des M. A.*"; Schmidt, "*Histoire et Doctrine de la Secte des Cathares ou Albigeois*"; Conybeare, "The Key of Truth" (Introduction and Appendix). See also literature on the Waldenses, a large part of which is common to the two parties. *Cf.* my "Recent Researches Concerning Mediæval Sects" (in "Proceedings of the Am. Soc. of Ch. Hist.," Vol. IV.).

1. *The Bogomiles.*

(1) *Rise of the Party.* The Bogomiles were a Bulgarian sect, about whose origin little has been definitely ascertained, and the extant accounts of whom are "for the most part hopelessly confused and untrustworthy."[1] They are thought to sustain a very intimate relation to the Paulicians, on the one hand, and to the Cathari of western Europe on the other.

The settlement in Thrace of a vast number of Paulicians under Constantine Copronymus (middle of eighth century) and of one hundred thousand more under John Tzimiskes (970) was an event of fundamental importance to the religious development of Eastern Europe. Peter

---

[1] Conybeare, "Key of Truth," p. cxviii. of Introd.

Siculus, who resided for nine months in Tephrik, the ancient Paulician stronghold (*c.* 870), refers to the sending of missionaries by the Paulicians of Asia Minor to the heathen Bulgarians. It is probable that among the non-dualistic Paulicians, who emigrated to Thrace and who evangelized the Bulgarians, there were considerable numbers of dualistic Christians (Messalians, Euchites, etc.). If the account of Cedrenus (*c.* 1050) can be trusted, the dualistic type of teaching soon became prevalent throughout the whole of the European part of the Eastern empire. The Bogomiles seem thus to have been a product of the dissemination of this dualistic Christianity among the Slavonic populations. The name "Bogomiles" is said to mean "Friends of God."

(2) *Teaching of the Bogomiles.* About 1111 the Emperor Alexius Comnenus, alarmed by the rapid spread of the Bogomiles, insinuated himself into the confidence of their leader and induced him to give a full exposition of the doctrines and practices of the party, which concealed scribes carefully recorded. From this record we gather the following particulars:

a. An elaborate dualistic cosmology, like that of the Gnostics and Manichæans, seems to have been fundamental to their system. The details need not be given.

b. They held to a doctrine of the Trinity resembling the Sabellian. The incarnation was a mere appearance (Docetism). Christ's work on earth was to overthrow the rule of fallen spirits that were dominant here.

c. They are said to have rejected water baptism, and to have substituted for it a very solemn purificatory ceremony, preceded by seven days of fasting and prayer. The ceremony consisted in placing upon the head of the candidate the Gospel of John, invoking the Holy Spirit, and repeating the Lord's Prayer. After a further period of testing and instruction in the mysteries of the sect, the candidate was admitted into the inner circle. The initiatory ceremony was concluded with the laying-on of hands.

d. They are represented as rejecting the Lord's Supper, holding that the bread of the Communion is the Lord's Prayer, and that the cup is the last discourses of our Lord in the Gospel.

e. Like the Manichæans they are said to have rejected marriage and the use of flesh for food.

f. Like the Paulicians they rejected the use of images as idolatry and regarded the Greek and Roman Catholic churches as Satanic.

g. They are represented as accepting the Old Testament psalms and prophets, but as rejecting the Mosaic law as the work of Satanael (the evil deity) devised, for the corruption and enslavement of mankind.

h. They employed the allegorical method of interpreting the Scriptures in the most fantastic way.

(3) *Fate of the Party*. Severe persecution followed the discoveries made by Alexius. Multitudes of the Bogomiles were massacred. But they are said to have survived in small numbers to modern times. It seems certain that the western Cathari long looked upon Bulgaria as the source and center of their denominational life and that they recognized the head of the Bogomiles as their spiritual father.

2. *The Cathari.*

(1) *Rise of Catharism*. It is probable that Manichæism survived to some extent in southwestern Europe from the sixth to the eleventh century. The same may be said of Priscillianism. The presence of the Saracens in Spain was highly favorable to the development of Oriental forms of heresy, especially as these latter had in many cases joined hands with the Mohammedans against persecuting Catholicism. In 991 Gerbert (afterward Pope Sylvester II.), on the occasion of his consecration as Archbishop of Rheims, took occasion to denounce certain Gnostic errors, which were doubtless giving trouble at the time.

After several isolated cases of dualistic heresy had been brought to light, an extensive dualistic movement was discovered in Aquitania and Orleans (1022). These heretics are represented by a contemporary monk as "seducing the populace, denying holy baptism and the virtue of the cross, abstaining from foods, as if they were monks, and simulating chastity." The heresy is said to have been brought from Italy by a certain woman, who led astray not only the common people, but also many among the better educated of the clergy. Ten of the canonical clergy were burned in Orleans (1022).

About 1025 a band of heretics appeared at Arras. Like the later mystics they rejected the ordinances of the papal church, and regarded outward ordinances in general as matters of small importance. They claimed to hold to nothing but the Scriptures, but to hold to these in word and in deed. Their principles were: to relinquish the world, to curb the flesh from concupiscence, to obtain support by the labor of their own hands, to injure no one, to show charity to their fellow-believers. This standard attained, there was no need of baptism. Especially was infant baptism worthless. So also they rejected ceremonial marriage and the veneration of confessors, and denied the efficacy of penitence for sins committed after profession. The arguments of their opponents indicate that they rejected, after the manner of the Manichæans, all intercourse of the sexes. They held a private room to be as sacred as a church, and altars to be no better than other heaps of stones. They were, therefore, intense Protestants and mystics; and had, apparently, some dualistic tendencies.[1] These bands of heretics multiplied in France during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries.

(2) *Doctrines and Practices of the Cathari.* From the records of the Inquisition and from other Roman Catholic accounts we have detailed information regarding the doctrines and practices of the Cathari in general and of the different parties among them. The only important extant documents originating with themselves are a Ritual and a version of the New Testament. According to Salva Burce (1235) and Rainer Sacchoni (*c.* 1259) there were two chief parties of the Cathari, who according to the former,[2] "are called Albanenses and Concorricii," and whom he represents as at mortal enmity, each claiming to be exclusively "the church of God." He also refers to a third party called Calojani or Francigenæ. He speaks of unsuccessful efforts that have been made to harmonize these parties in order that they might more effectively contend against the Catholics.

---

[1] D'Achery, "*Spicilegium,*" Vol. I., p. 607, *seq.*

[2] See "*Supra Stella,*" Döllinger, *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 53, *seq.*

a. He represents the two chief parties as agreeing in rejecting marriage as fornication and as an ordinance of the devil, the Albanenses giving a spiritual meaning to all New Testament passages referring to matrimony, the Concorricii admitting that some passages refer to carnal matrimony, but holding that it is not allowable in the church, *i. e.*, for those that aspire to evangelical perfection.

b. The Albanenses denied that Christ and his apostles actually healed the bodies of men, regarding the flesh as a work of the devil and as unworthy of divine consideration; the Concorricii admitted that Christ healed the bodies as well as the souls of men.

c. The Albanenses were absolute dualists, holding "that there are two creators without beginning and middle and end," and accounted for the blending of good and evil in the present world and in man in a purely Manichæan fashion. The Concorricii maintained that there was "only one creator," and accounted for the evil in man by the fall of Satan, who divided the elements of the good God and fashioned thereof the body of Adam, into which he forced one of the minor angels so that he became a living soul. They taught that Eve, who was extracted from Adam, was seduced by the serpent of whom she conceived Cain, and herself seduced Adam. They claimed that "all human generation in its totality proceeds from Adam according to the flesh and according to the spirit, in such manner that all our spirits have descended from the angel that Lucifer . . . placed in Adam; whence they say that what is born of the flesh is flesh, and what is born of the spirit is spirit."

d. Both parties agreed in ascribing the Old Testament to the prince of evil.[1]

e. Both parties held to a docetic view of Christ, denying that he ate, drank, suffered, etc., and that he had a carnal body.

f. Both laid great stress upon the imposition of hands (the *Consolamentum*), whereby those that are already sanctified (the perfect) impart the Holy Spirit and salvation to others. This was administered after a long period of training and the most solemn promises of fidelity and secrecy. The *Consolamentum*, according to all the sources, took the place of water baptism. The validity of this ordinance depended wholly upon the worthiness of the administrator, and it must be repeated in case the administrator prove to have been unworthy.

---

[1] For the Catharistic arguments to prove the evil origin and character of the Old Testament see a document from the archives of the Inquisition of Carcassonne in Lea, "Hist. of the Inquisition," Vol. I., p. 563, *seq.*; *cf.* Moneta, "*Adversus Catharos,*" *Lib.* II., *Cap.* 6.

g. The outer circle (believers) seem, according to the best accounts, to have ordinarily postponed the reception of the *Consolamentum* till death was supposed to be approaching. This enabled them to mingle somewhat freely in the world and to enter the future life with all their sins forgiven. Having received it, even in cases where recovery seemed possible, food was sometimes withheld, lest the benefit of the *Consolamentum* should be lost. This starving of the "consoled" was called the *Endura*, and their enemies made the most of the criminality involved in the transaction.

The Albigensian Ritual shows that the *Endura* was not always employed; for it gives directions as to the course to be pursued by one consoled on a sick-bed in case of recovery. No doubt in some instances the candidate preferred, after having been fully prepared for death, to avoid the means to recovery; and it is probable that in some cases the elect favored the practice of withholding food.

(3) *The Provençal Ritual of the Albigenses*. This important document, preserved in a Lyons Codex, has recently been translated into English by Conybeare.[1] It is preceded by a number of short invocations. It begins with a somewhat elaborate confession of sins and prayer for pardon, each paragraph concluding with: "Bless, spare us" (*Benedicite, parcite nobis*). Then follows the ceremony of the reception by a believer of the Lord's Prayer. The believer appears fasting and washed, performs with considerable ceremony his *Melioramentum*, or act of contrition, and receives the book from the hand of an elder. An elaborate exhortation to purity and fidelity precedes the delivery to him of the Lord's Prayer. He now for the first time receives from God, the elders, and the church the right to use this prayer. This impartation of the power carries with it the obligation henceforth

---

[1] "Key of Truth," Appendix VI.

"to say it all the time of" his "life, by day and by night, alone and in company." It is to be used always before eating and drinking.

Directions for the administration of the *Consolamentum* follow, with elaborate ceremonial. Abundant scriptural authority is given for the laying-on of hands and the impartation therewith of the Holy Spirit. "This holy baptism by the imposition of hands was instituted by Jesus Christ." It corresponds with the baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire spoken of by John the Baptist. It is claimed that "this holy baptism by which the Holy Spirit is given, the church of God [meaning their own communion] hath kept from the apostles until now, and it hath passed from good men to good men until the present, and will continue to do so until the end of the world."

The person thus "baptized" puts himself under obligation to live according to the Sermon on the Mount and places himself and his property at the disposal of the church.

The Ritual closes with directions for the administration of the *Consolamentum* to the sick.

The Ritual shows a firm grasp of New Testament principles. It makes no reference to the Old Testament, which was probably rejected by its authors. There is nothing distinctively dualistic in the document, but it probably represents the moderate dualism of the Concorricii. There is no reference to the Lord's Supper. This ordinance was probably identified with their regular meals, which must be preceded by the Lord's Prayer. It is altogether likely that this ritual was used by a large party of Catharistic Christians, in whom, by contact with Petrobrusians, Waldenses, etc., dualistic elements had been reduced to a minimum, and evangelical conceptions had been brought into prominence.

(4) *The Diffusion and Fate of Catharism.* Within a few years of their first appearance in France and Italy, the Cathari had spread over France, Italy, Spain, Germany, the Netherlands, and even into England. They are represented by a monkish opponent as like the sands of the sea for multitude.

a. Through the influence of Peter de Bruys, Henry of Lausanne, and their followers, and of the Cathari, who had already gained many adherents, almost the whole of

Southern France had become anti-Catholic by the middle of the twelfth century.

In 1147 Bernard, the great preacher of his age, traversed the country with a view to recalling the people from their heretical pravity, but could not get a hearing. Princes and nobles protected the heretics. In 1178 a cardinal legate, Peter, attended by numerous prelates and monks, made a similar attempt with like results. In 1180 Alexander III. sent forth a Cardinal Henry to preach a crusade against the Albigenses. Many were slain, and others forced to abjure, but the heresy remained as powerful as before. At the beginning of the thirteenth century nearly all the princes and barons of the south of France were favorers of the heretics, and the heretics were allowed to assemble for worship in castles and fortified towns.

The Albigenses[1] are represented by Catholic writers indiscriminately as Cathari or Manichæans. That many of them were such, rejecting the Old Testament, outward ordinances, etc., and holding to a dualistic idea of God and the universe, is probable. Yet there were undoubtedly among them many evangelical followers of Peter de Bruys and Henry. See below.

b. After the many vain attempts to suppress the Albigensian heresy, Innocent III., when he became pope, resolved to extirpate it. He sent forth two legates, with full power over bishops and princes, and offered indulgences to those that should aid them. Diego, bishop of Osma, with Dominic (afterward founder of the Dominican order), persuaded the legates to adopt more apostolical measures. Accordingly the legates, with a number of others, wandered barefooted from place to place, without money, etc., and held several conferences with the heretics. This failing, they resorted to violent measures. The legate, Peter of Castelnau, was murdered in 1208. Count Raymond of Toulouse was suspected of complicity in the murder. Innocent III. now caused a crusade to be preached against the region: the extirpators of heresy were to have the territory and the spoils, and plenary indulgence was to be granted to those that should take part. A large army was soon raised, with the fanatical Arnold, the papal legate who had preached the crusade, at its head. City after city was sacked, and the inhabitants slaughtered and outraged. The work of devastation went on for years, and the country was almost depopulated. Some of the heretics escaped to Spain, where they were afterward hunted down by the Inquisition. Many took refuge in the Netherlands, where heretics were numerous till the Reformation. In a word, they were scattered throughout Europe. They seem to have continued throughout the period, though they were doubtless gradually absorbed by the more evangelical parties. The blending of the more evangelical types of Catharism with the non-dualistic evangelical life enables us to account for the dualistic features sometimes ascribed to parties that were otherwise thoroughly evangelical.

---

[1] The name Albigenses is derived from the region of Albi, in Southern France.

II. CHILIASTIC AND ENTHUSIASTIC SECTS.

As the hierarchy grew more and more corrupt and oppressive, and as the hopes of reform from within became less and less, enthusiasts arose, who on the basis of the apocalyptic Scriptures undertook to prophesy regarding the course of events that should lead through a time of still greater disaster to a glorious age in which righteousness and blessedness should prevail.

1. *Joachim of Floris and the Joachimites.*

LITERATURE: Works of Joachim; Döllinger, "The Prophetic Spirit and the Prophecies of the Christian Era," ed. H. B. Smith; Renan, "*Joachim de Flore et l'Evangile Eternel*" (in "*Rev. de Deux Mondes*," 1866, pp. 94–142); Preger, "*Gesch. d. Mystik*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 196, *seq.*, and "*Das Evangelium Eternum u. Joach. von Floris*"; Reuter, "*Gesch. d. Aufklärung im M. A.*," *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 191–218; Lea, "Hist. of the Inquis.," Vol. III., p. 10, *seq.*; Tocco, "*L' Eresia nel Medio Evo*," p. 265, *seq.*; Hahn, "*Gesch. d. Ketzer im M. A.*," *Bd.* III., *Seit.* 72–175 and 259–346; Haupt, "*Zur Gesch. d. Joachimismus*" ("*Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*," *Bd.* VII., *Seit.* 372, *seq.*); Denifle, "*Das Evang. Aetern.*" (in "*Archiv f. Lit. u. Kirchengesch. d. M. A.*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 49, *seq.*).

(1) *Sketch of Joachim.* Joachim, a Sicilian (b. *c.* 1145), made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land and soon afterward became abbot of a Cistercian monastery in Italy (*c.* 1178),

and began to prophesy (*c.* 1183 or earlier). He conferred with and greatly interested three popes, Lucius III. (1183), Urban III. (1185), and Clement III. (1188). About 1190 he left his monastery and went into retirement, but soon afterward, supported by the Emperor Henry VI., he founded a new monastery at Floris, whose rigorous rules were approved by Pope Cœlestine III. (1196). The order spread rapidly and Joachim's fantastic expositions of Scripture were highly appreciated by popes and people. A large body of apocalyptic literature, in addition to his own products, became associated with his name, and his influence in later enthusiastic chiliastic movements was very great. He claimed to have had the entire fullness of the meaning of the Apocalypse miraculously revealed to him, and he supposed that all the mysteries of Scripture were as clear to him as to the biblical prophets themselves. Joachim died *c.* 1202.

(2) *Joachim's Prophetical Scheme.* He divided the history of the world into three epochs: that of the Father (or the Petrine), up to Christ; that of the Son (Pauline), from the birth of Christ to 1260; and that of the Holy Ghost (Johannean), 1260 onward. He attempted to give in detail the events from 1200 to 1260. The papacy, which had made the church "a house of prostitution" and "a den of robbers" and which he identified with Antichrist, was to fall into utter ruin at the hands of the emperor, who was to deprive it of power and possessions. The empire was then to be destroyed by the Saracens and ten kings from the East, who in turn were to be annihilated by the Tartars from the North. The divine instrument for the reformation of the church and the ushering in of the epoch of the Holy Ghost was to be an order of contemplative monks. Such a spirited programme, announced by himself and his disciples with the utmost confidence and enthusiasm, naturally caused intense excitement. The complete failure of these prophecies, including that of the inauguration of a new age in 1260, was somewhat discouraging, but the prophets were ready with their explanations, and they modified their scheme from time to time to suit the exigencies as they arose.

Joachim was not the originator of this type of religious thought, but he wrought it out with great fullness, and from him, directly or indirectly, most later chiliastic systems have derived their impulse. It is surprising how little freshness there is in modern chiliastic schemes.

2. *The Spirituales.*

LITERATURE: Lea, "Hist. of the Inquisition," Vol. III., pp. 1–89; Müller, "*Die Anfänge des Minoritenordens*"; Döllinger (as on Joachim); Loofs, "*Das Testament d. Franz von Assisi*" ("*Christl. Welt*," 1894); Lives of Francis of Assisi, by Sabatier, Hase, Wilkens, Knox-Little, Böhringer, Monnier, etc.; Zöckler, "*Askese u. Mönchthum*"; and art. on "*Franz von Assisi*," in Herzog-Hauck, third ed., where a full bibliography is given.

(1) *The Early Spiritual Franciscans.*—It was among the stricter element of the Franciscan order that the doctrines of Joachim found most acceptance and the Spirituales or the Spiritual Franciscans are to be regarded as essentially Joachimites. Francis was an ascetic of the most extreme type, and it was his intention that the rule of absolute poverty should be perpetually enforced by his order as regards individuals and the community as a whole. To assure this end, he left behind him a will in which he made the rules of the order unchangeable. Some time before his death (1226) a party of progress had appeared, led by Elias of Cortona, who repudiated the principle of communal poverty and insisted that the order could do its proper work only by accumulating all the wealth possible, erecting imposing buildings, etc. After Francis' death discord in the order soon became acute. Elias was not at once appointed his successor, but he controlled the policy of the new general and began at once to collect funds for the erection of a magnificent church as a receptacle of the bones of Francis. This provoked controversy. In 1230 Elias sought, on the occasion of the translation of the corpse of Francis to its new abiding place, to secure by intrigue the deposition of the general and his own election. Turbulent proceedings resulted in his temporary defeat, but in 1232 the general, Giovanni, was deposed and Elias elected. He soon showed himself a most unscrupulous and cruel tyrant. Those who resisted his measures were scourged, imprisoned, and some of them put to death. Pope Honorius III. had refused to sustain the will of Francis. Gregory IX. was

appealed to by the persecuted party and was induced to condemn and excommunicate Elias, who took refuge with the Emperor Frederick II., the enemy of the pope. But the lax party speedily gained the ascendency. The order was spreading rapidly and with the pope's consent acquiring property. In 1248 the strict party secured the election of John of Parma as general, who earnestly sought to restore the order to its original purity and simplicity and was unsparing in his denunciations of the lax party. Innocent IV. supported the lax party and Alexander IV. removed all restrictions to the academic activity of the order (1257), facilitating their access to the professorships of the universities.

(2) *The Everlasting Gospel*. By this time the leaders of the strict party had become imbued with the prophetic spirit and the chiliasm of the Joachimites. In 1254 appeared "The Everlasting Gospel" (referring to Rev. 14 : 6). It consisted of three of Joachim's prophetical works, with introduction, notes, and applications to current events. Joachim's date for the end of the age (1260) still held good, and the dispensation of the Holy Ghost would be inaugurated in six years. The publication of this work created immense excitement. Gherardo, a leader of the strict party, who had obtained a chair in the University of Paris, seems to have been the editor. It constituted one of the boldest attacks on the papacy that had yet been made, and the Spiritual Franciscans who sympathized with it thereby put themselves in the position of a heretical sect. Gherardo was thrown into prison where, on a diet of bread and water, he languished for eighteen years, remaining faithful to his convictions. John of Parma resigned and retracted, and is said for thirty-two years to have lived the life of an angel and to have remained a faithful Joachimite. Bonaventura, his successor, sought to harmonize the discordant elements and to curb the laxity of the dominant party.

(3) *Persecution of the Spirituales*. The council of Lyons (1374) gave the Mendicants the right to hold property. This action intensified the inner strife of the Franciscans. The Spirituales were now cruelly persecuted, large numbers of them rotting in prison, deprived of spiritual as well as material help. Boniface IX. surrendered them

to the tender mercies of the Inquisition (1296–1297). The details of their sufferings cannot here be given.

(4) *Pierre Jean Olivi.* The most noted representative of the Spirituales during the latter part of the thirteenth century was Pierre Jean Olivi, whose writings were condemned and who, after his death (1298), was adjudged a heretic.

The modified Joachimism of the Spiritual Franciscans became widespread through persecution and we need henceforth never be at a loss to account for the appearance of this mode of thought. The identification of the papacy with Antichrist became one of the fixed thoughts in the minds of chiliastic reformers everywhere. We see the influence of Joachim and the Spirituales in Wycliffe, in the predecessors of Huss in Bohemia, such as Militz, Matthias of Janow, etc., in the Taborites, and in the chiliastic Anabaptists of the sixteenth century.

III. PANTHEISTIC HERESY.

1. *Amalric of Bena* (*d.* 1207).

LITERATURE: Preger, "*Gesch. d. deutschen Mystik*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 166, *seq.*, and 173, *seq.*; Jundt, "*Hist. du Panthéisme populaire au M. A.*"; Lea, "Hist. of the Inquisition," Vol. II., p. 320, *seq.*; art. "Amalric" in Herzog-Hauck, third ed.

(1) *Sketch of Amalric.* Amalric was professor of philosophy and then of theology in the University of Paris and was a favorite of Prince Louis, the heir apparent. Condemned for heresy by the university (1204), he appealed to the pope, who compelled him to abjure (1207). He is said to have died of mortification shortly afterward. He was charged with teaching that "God is everything (or all things), that each Christian is bound to believe that he is a member of Christ, no one who does not believe this being saved, and that to those constituted in love no sin is imputed."

(2) *The Amalricians.* His followers are said to have divided religious history into three ages: the age of the Father, beginning with the incarnation of God in Abraham; the age of the Son, beginning with the incarnation of God in Mary (Jesus); the age of the Spirit, beginning with the incarnation of God in the Amalricians. With the inauguration of the age of the Son the Mosaic law ceased to be binding (antinomianism). With the inaugu-

ration of the age of the Spirit the ordinances of Christ were abrogated. They rejected therefore all external ordinances. The resurrection of the dead they supposed to be accomplished in the regeneration of the believer. Hell they identified with a consciousness of sin. They claimed that God spoke in Ovid as much as in Augustine, and that every man is God in precisely the same sense as Christ is God. They are said to have held that to one who is in the Spirit the deeds of the flesh do not constitute sin.

The Amalricians seem never to have become very numerous. From time to time they fell into the hands of the Inquisition. Their influence on later bodies will appear hereafter.

2. *Beghards and Beguines.*

LITERATURE: Mosheim, "*De Beghardis*"; Hahn, "*Gesch. d. Ketzer*," *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 420, *seq.*; Jundt, "*Hist. du Panthéisme pop.*," p. 42, *seq.*; Lea, "Hist. of the Inq.," Vol. II., p. 350, *seq.*; Haupt, "*D. rel. Sekten in Franken*," *Seit.* 5, *seq.*, and art. in Herzog-Hauck, third ed.; Döllinger, "*Sektengeschichte*," *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 378, *seq.*, and 702, *seq.*

These semi-monastic brotherhoods and sisterhoods probably owed their origin to the priest Lambert de Bègue (d. 1187). The sisterhoods seem first to have come into prominence. The age was one of great religious excitement, and the Crusades had withdrawn hundreds of thousands of men from the population, leaving multitudes of women without opportunity of marriage and unprovided for. This accounts in part for the founding of these institutions, whose members engaged largely in the work of caring for the sick, and who supported themselves by manual labor and if necessary by begging. Many of them became fanatical under the influence of the Spiritual Franciscans and from other causes. Similar institutions for men appeared early in the thirteenth century. They spread rapidly throughout Europe, being especially numerous in the Netherlands and adjoining countries. Some of the brotherhoods and sisterhoods came under the influence of the pantheistic teachings of the Amalricians and adopted the immoral views and practices ascribed to the latter.

3. *Brethren of the Free Spirit.*

LITERATURE: Hahn, "*Gesch. d. Ketzer,*" *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 470, *seq.*; Lea, "Hist. of the Inq.," Vol. II., p. 123, *seq.*, 322, *seq.*, 404, *seq.*; Wattenbach, "*Ueber d. Sekte d. Brüder v. fr. Geiste*" (in the "Proceedings of the Bav. Acad.," 1887); Jundt, "*Hist. du Panthéisme*"; Preger, "*Gesch. d. deutschen Mystik*"; Reuter, "*Gesch. d. rel. Aufklärung im M. A.,*" *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 240, *seq.*; Haupt, in Herzog-Hauck, third ed., "*Brüder d. fr. Geistes.*"

The Brethren of the Free Spirit are not accurately distinguished in mediæval writings from the Amalricians and the Beghards. It is not probable that all the parties thus designated, who were arraigned from time to time in different parts of Europe from the middle of the thirteenth century onward, were historically connected the one with the other, but all alike were directly or indirectly related to Amalric. It is probable that the later Brethren of the Free Spirit owed their origin more directly to the pantheistic teachings of Master Eckart, which the unlearned and less churchly could easily have perverted into the antinomianism with which they are charged. Some of the Brethren are represented as ascetical and pure in their lives, but as rejecting all church ordinances and holding to the set of views known as Amalrician, while others are represented as, like some of the Amalricians, denying that carnal indulgences are sinful for the spiritual man.

There is no sufficient reason for connecting the Brethren of the Free Spirit with the Ortidiebarians, who seem to have been fundamentally a Catharistic sect with Waldensian antecedents, or with Nicholas of Basel, the "Friend of God" (d. 1397).

There was no doubt in some cases a blending of the apocalyptic-chiliastic teaching of the Joachimites with the pantheistic teachings of Amalric.

The popular pantheism of the Middle Ages persisted until the sixteenth century, when it reappeared in the Libertines and related parties. In one form or other it still reappears from time to time (as in "Christian Science," etc.).

IV. EVANGELICAL SEPARATISM.

1. *The Petrobrusians and the Henricians.*

LITERATURE: Peter the Venerable, "*Tractatus adversus Petrobrusianos Hæreticos*"; Döllinger, "*Sektengeschichte,*" *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 75, *seq.*;

Gieseler, "Ecc. Hist.," Vol. II., p. 533, *seq.;* Lea, "Hist. of the Inquisition," Vol. I., p. 69, *seq.;* Neander, "*Der heil. Bernard u. sein Zeitalter*"; Hahn, "*Gesch. d. Ketzer im M. A.*," *Bd.* I.; Füsslin, "*Kirchen- und Ketzergesch.*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 189, *seq.*

(1) *Antecedents and Rise of these Parties.* It is impossible to determine with certainty the source of the impulse that started the Roman Catholic priest Peter de Bruys and the Roman Catholic monk Henry of Lausanne on their reformatory careers. No doubt a considerable amount of evangelical life and thought had been perpetuated in the corrupt churches that had come under the control of the Roman hierarchy. Protests against ecclesiastical corruption had been uttered by churchmen from time to time during the period of growing corruption.

a. Claudius of Turin (d. 832 or earlier), a native of Spain, sent by the Emperor Louis the Pious as bishop of Turin to counteract Mohammedan influence and to contend against the prevailing heathenism in northern Italy, adopted Augustine's theology, after eliminating its sacerdotal elements, and on the basis of the Scriptures insisted upon the immediateness of the relation of the believer to God. "Whoever seeks from any creature in heaven or on earth the salvation which he should seek from God alone, is an idolater." He denounced image worship and removed images from the churches over which he presided. Departed saints, he taught, do not wish to be worshiped and can render us no service. Prayers for the dead are of no avail. The worship of the cross he regarded as absurd. We had as well worship every virgin, because Christ was born of a virgin, and every manger because he rested in one. We are to bear the cross, not worship it. Crucifixes were an abomination to him. Pilgrimages to Rome and elsewhere for merit he discountenanced, holding to the futility of all external works as means of gaining the divine favor. He denied that any one is apostolical because he sits in the seat of an apostle. He denied that Peter had received any power to bind and to loose and regarded him as the divinely commissioned founder of the Jewish, as Paul was of the Gentile, church. That so thoroughgoing and aggressive an evangelical should have been permitted to end his life in the episcopate of the hierarchical church is evidence of the comparative freedom that still existed, and there can be no doubt but that his influence long continued to be felt in Northern Italy and Southern France. Claudius may be regarded as having revived or perpetuated the influence of Jovinian and Vigilantius, and as a connecting link between these early reformers and the evangelicals of the twelfth century.

b. Again, it is possible that side by side with the dualistic heresy that from time to time attracted the attention of the authorities during the eleventh century a purer form of evangelical dissent may have found place. From the considerations set forth in the preceding section it is evident that the Cathari differed greatly among themselves in the nature and degree of their dualism. It is probable that in some the dualistic element did not much exceed the bounds of orthodoxy, and that the evangelical element closely approached in its strength and purity what we find in the Petrobrusians and their successors. Men educated in the Roman Catholic Church, like Peter and Henry, might well have been awakened by the purity of life, the zeal, and the self-sacrificing spirit of the better class of Cathari, while their knowledge of the Scriptures and of the evangelical writings of the earlier time would have sufficed to guard them from dualistic error.

To conclude with Döllinger, that because we can find only Catharistic antecedents for the Petrobrusians and Henricians, and because the latter agreed with the former in rejecting infant baptism, image worship, cross worship, saint worship, the use of consecrated church buildings, and all of the non-scriptural appurtenances of the hierarchical church, Peter and Henry were themselves Cathari, is wholly unjustified. That they were not Cathari is evident from the following considerations: (*a*) The Cathari, as we know them, rejected water baptism; the Petrobrusians are charged with rejecting infant baptism and with rebaptizing those christened in infancy. (*b*) The Cathari abstained from animal food; the Petrobrusians are accused of violating fasts. (*c*) The Cathari rejected marriage; Peter is charged with compelling monks "by terrors and torments to marry," and Henry with removing impediments to marriage and urging men and women who had lived irregularly to enter the married state. (*d*) Their chief Catholic opponent does not stigmatize them as Manichæan and refrains from accusing them of rejecting the Old Testament.[1]

---

[1] For fuller refutation of Döllinger's position see article by the author in "Proceedings of the American Society of Church History," Vol. IV., p. 183, *seq*.

(2) *Sketches of Peter and Henry.* *a.* Little is known of the life of Peter de Bruys before his appearance as a reformer (*c.* 1104). ~~For the facts~~ of his career we are dependent almost wholly on the polemical writing of Peter the Venerable, and a slight notice in Abelard's "Introduction to Theology." From these we learn that he was a priest; that he was a ~~pupil of Abelard, the great free-thinker~~ of the century; that for over twenty years he preached throughout Southern France, where the Cathari ~~already abounded,~~ with enthusiasm and success, baptizing large numbers on a profession of their faith, denouncing the use of crosses and destroying them when he could, and causing priests and monks to be despised and sometimes roughly handled by the people; that, though his preaching was subversive of the established order, he was able for many years to defy the hierarchy and to preserve life and liberty; and that he was at last burned (*c.* 1126) on a heap of crosses that he had lighted, are the chief facts recorded.

Peter the Venerable, addressing the authorities in a region where Peter and Henry had been at work, wrote: "In your parts the people are rebaptized, the churches profaned, the altars overthrown, crosses burned, on the very day of our Lord's passion flesh is publicly eaten, priests are scourged, monks imprisoned and compelled by terrors and tortures to marry." Again: "O miserable men, whoever you are, who have yielded not to many nations, but to two wretched little men only, Peter de Bruys and Henry, his pseudo-apostle."

b. To the wonderful eloquence and popularity of Henry of Lausanne abundant testimony is borne by his Catholic contemporaries. We first meet him (*c.* 1116) as a Clugniac monk, left in charge of the spiritual work of his diocese by the bishop of Mans during his visit to Rome. The records of the diocese show how he utilized his position. He had already gained a great reputation for strictness of living, humility, and courage. "~~By his speech,~~" it was said, "a heart of stone could easily be moved to compunction." He soon had the diocese thoroughly awakened regarding spiritual things. Clergy and people were moved to tears by his earnest appeals. He is said to have resounded in so oracular a manner that it appeared as if legions of demons howled forth their murmurs at one opening of his mouth. "Nevertheless he was in a wonderful manner eloquent, his speech infused through their ears adhered to the minds of the common people like fresh poison." The people rose up in fury against the clergy and their familiars, regarding them as heathen and publicans, and refusing to sell to them or buy from them. It was thought that had not the civil authorities intervened they would have destroyed the priests' houses, scattered their goods, and would have stoned the priests themselves. Immoral women were induced publicly to burn their meretricious attire and their hair. He convinced the people that they need not insist upon receiving with their wives, gold, silver, possessions, or marriage portions, or bestow a dowry, but that an empty-handed man might marry an empty-handed woman, and that all conventionalities in regard to marriage might be ignored. Some who had lived unchastely together were induced to marry. He took up collections in order that some provision might be made for the extremely poor. He seems to have regarded marriage as the best remedy for the terrible immorality that prevailed in the diocese.

Henry is said to have associated himself with Peter de Bruys and for ten years these zealous preachers carried on conjointly their evangelistic work. In 1134 he was arrested by the archbishop of Arles and was pronounced a heretic in the Council of Pisa, but he was on some ground permitted to depart and he resumed his propaganda with unabated zeal. In 1147 Pope Eugenius III. commissioned Bernard of Clairvaux and the Cardinal Albericus to counteract his destructive work in Languedoc, etc. It was found that the people would not come near the churches, despised the "divine mystery," and refused to pay the customary dues or to accord the customary reverence to the priests. Henry was thrown into prison, where he probably died in 1148.

(3) *Doctrines and Practices of Peter and his Followers*. Peter the Venerable, a contemporary, charges them with the following heretical (?) views:

a. They denied that children before they had come to an intelligible age could be saved by the baptism of Christ; that another person's faith could profit those that could not use their own—according to the Scripture:

"He that believeth," etc. They protested against the charge that they rebaptized, regarding the christening of infants as unworthy of the name.

b. They maintained that temples and churches ought not to be built, and that those built ought to be torn down; that sacred places were not necessary for worship; that God hears prayers as well in a tavern as in a church, in a market-place as in a temple, before a stable as before an altar.

c. They maintained that crosses ought to be broken to pieces and burned, denying that the instruments by which Christ was cruelly slain should be adored, or venerated, or supplicated.

d. They denied that the body and blood of Christ could be wrought and offered by the priest, regarding the claim to do so as absurd and sacrilegious. They are charged not simply with rejecting the papal view of the Lord's Supper, but also, apparently, with rejecting the outward ordinance altogether. If so, it was probably on account of its superstitious associations.

e. Sacrifices, prayers, alms, and other works for the dead, made by the living, they derided, holding that such things were of no avail, each one's lot being decided permanently at death.

f. That God is mocked by ecclesiastical chanting, because he who delights in pious feelings alone, can neither be appealed to by high tones, nor soothed by musical modulations.

g. In addition to these points, Peter the Venerable informs us casually that Peter de Bruys rejected the authority of the Fathers and of tradition, adhering to the Scriptures alone. Peter the Venerable had heard that they held only to the Gospels, rejecting the Old Testament and parts of the New Testament, but was not sure that this was true.

2. *Arnold of Brescia, the Arnoldists, the Humiliati, and the Poor Men of Lombardy.*

LITERATURE: R. Breyer, "*Arnold von Brescia*" (in Maurenbrecher's "*Historischen Taschenbuch*," 1889), "*Die Arnoldisten*," (in Brieger's "*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*," XII., 1891); Giesebrecht, "*Arnold von Brescia*," 1873; Tocco, "*L' Eresia nel Medio Evo*," 1884; Hausrath, "*Arnold von Brescia*," 1891; excellent art. by Deutsch in Herzog-Hauck, third ed., *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 117–122.

(1) *Sketch of Arnold.* The main facts of Arnold's remarkable career are well known. He was of noble lineage, and was born and reared at Brescia. Like Peter de Bruys he studied under the famous teacher and freethinker, Peter Abelard. On his return to Italy, full of zeal for the reformation of Church and State, he was admitted into one of the lower grades of the clergy. But he saw in the secularization of the church, and in the devotion of clergy, high and low, and of the monastic orders as well, to the accumulation of wealth as means of luxury and oppression, the root of the corruptions of the time, and he was able to give all the greater emphasis to his scathing denunciations of ecclesiastical corruption by reason of his own austerity and sanctity of life. He demanded the complete renunciation of all wealth, on the part of the church as a whole and of individual clergy and monks, high and low, and a complete withdrawal from all secular affairs, insisting that to the civil rulers alone all property rightly belongs, to be administered for the well-being of the people, and that the clergy should be supported entirely by the freewill offerings of the people. Owing to a general recognition of the extreme corruptions of the time, his views met with general acceptance throughout Northern Italy, but having been accused of heresy by his bishop in a Lateran synod he was obliged to leave Italy in 1139. He returned to France, where he defended Abelard against Bernard and others, and soon had this fierce and unrelenting heresy-hunter on his track. He went thence to Switzerland, where he labored with acceptance and success for a time under the protection of the liberally inclined bishop of Constance, until the zeal of Bernard, who warned the bishop not to harbor this "roaring lion," this "enemy of the church," wrought his expulsion from Switzerland. He found protection with a papal legate who soon became Pope Cœlestin II., and in Rome during a decade (1145–1155) he was at the head of a popular movement that aimed at the restoration of the ancient form of government and was able to expel the pope and to establish and

maintain for a while a new *régime*. In the treaty between Frederick Barbarossa and Pope Alexander III. he was basely sacrificed by the former to the latter, and executed in pursuance of this arrangement. He was hanged, his dead body was burned, and his ashes were cast into the Tiber, lest his followers should gather his remains for sacred relics.

(2) *Arnold's Reformatory Views.* The questions about which there has been difference of opinion are the following: Was Arnold a religious schismatic as well as a social and political agitator? Did he attack the doctrinal system of the church? Did he found a sect? We should attach very little importance to Bernard's railings, who stigmatizes him as a schismatic, if we had no better evidence to rely upon.

Otto, of Freising, one of the best informed and most judicial of the contemporary authorities, remarks that "besides these things (that is, his demand for reform in the directions mentioned above), he is said to have been astray with reference to the sacrament of the altar and the baptism of infants." The former part of this statement is confirmed by several writers; the second part has commonly been supposed to be unconfirmed and to rest upon a confounding of Arnold with Peter de Bruys and Henry of Lausanne.

It has recently been claimed by Breyer, to whom the writer is deeply indebted, that Durandus confirms Otto's report as to Arnold's unsatisfactory views on infant baptism,[1] and that this notice of Otto's can no longer be looked upon as resting on a confounding of Arnold with the Petrobrusians. It is pretty certain, at all events, that Arnold was no mere churchly reformer, but that he held to views radically antagonistic to the current orthodoxy. It would be natural to suppose, in view of his long-continued activity and his strong influence over the masses, that he impressed his views regarding the sacraments, as well as regarding political, social, and religious reform, on large numbers of his contemporaries.

---

[1] The passage cited by Breyer has reference not directly to Arnold, but rather to the Arnoldists. The use made of it by Breyer is justifiable only on the supposition that the Arnoldists derived their views from Arnold of Brescia. Durandus does not even say directly that the Arnoldists were astray as regards infant baptism; but their denial that the Holy Spirit is received in connection with the baptismal act is probably thought by Breyer to imply a radically anti-Romanist conception of the ordinance as such. The passage is as follows: "*Arnoldistæ . . . asserunt, quod nunquam per baptismum aquæ homines Spiritum sanctum accipiunt, nec Samaritani baptizati illum receperunt, donec manus impositionem acceperunt.*"

It is highly probable in itself that he founded a sect. The testimony of contemporaries changes the probability into a certainty. It is related by Johannes Saresberiensis in his "*Historia Pontificalis*," that during his stay in Rome Arnold "founded a sect of men which is still (about 1164) called the heresy of the Lombards," and that its adherents, on account of the uprightness, rigor, and piety of their lives, had found the most enthusiastic support among the people and especially among pious women. Johannes was resident in Rome during Arnold's time, and must have known whereof he affirmed. Arnold was beyond doubt the founder of a sect.

(3) *The Arnoldists.* The next question to be settled is, whether he was founder of the sect known during the succeeding century as the *Arnoldists.* The affirmative has been maintained by most writers, including Leger, Füsslin, Muratori, Dieckhoff, Tocco, and Keller; the negative by Gottfried Arnold, Guadagnini, and Giesebrecht. The latter view has rested, no doubt, on a failure to find convincing evidence that Arnold held to anti-Catholic views, or that he was the founder of any sect. Those who accept the evidence that Arnold founded a sect can hardly fail to regard it as highly probable that the Arnoldists of history derived their impulse as well as their name from Arnold of Brescia. The fact that the Arnoldists flourished in Lombardy, where Arnold's influence is known to have been greatest, is, moreover, strongly favorable to the identification of the Arnoldists with the followers of Arnold of Brescia.

What, then, were the views of the Arnoldists, and what do we know of their history? They agreed with Cathari, Petrobrusians, and other sects, in their uncompromising hostility to the Roman Catholic Church, directed especially against the secularization and the corrupt lives of the clergy, whose ministration of the sacraments they considered invalid. They denied the efficacy of water baptism to secure remission of sins, and laid considerable stress upon the imposition of hands as complementary to baptism. That, like the Cathari, they rejected water baptism and substituted therefor the *Consolamentum*, there is no credible evidence. Our information about the Arnoldists is extremely meager; but they are mentioned with sufficient frequency in the Roman Catholic literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries to prove that they persisted as a distinct party until long after the rise of the Waldenses. It is certain that, like Arnold and Peter de Bruys, they made the apostolic church their model, and aimed to restore Christianity to its primitive purity and simplicity. Tocco affirms "that the Poor Men of Lombardy descended in a direct line from the Arnoldists."

(4) *The Humiliati.* The origin of this party as regards circumstances and date is exceedingly obscure. It seems to have arisen some time between 1017 and 1184, probably during the reign of Frederick I. There is an old tradition, not improbable in itself, that it was organized by a party of Italian noblemen who were taken captive to Germany, and on their return resolved to abandon rank, to devote themselves to a semi-monastic communal life, and to support themselves by the labor of their hands. Their chief industry seems to have been wool-weaving, and they are said to have had almost a monopoly of this industry in certain parts of Italy.

Little is known of their views, except that they rejected oaths. The party seems at first to have been composed chiefly of laymen, and celibacy was not required. Before the close of the twelfth century there were two parties, one of which was in harmony with the church, and the other classed by the church among heretics. It is highly probable that the heretical Humiliati became so through Arnoldistic influence.

In 1184 Pope Lucius III., in a bull against the heresies of the time in Lombardy, mentioned the Humiliati and the Poor Men of Lyons as if they were one and the same party (*qui se humiliatos vel pauperes de Lugduno falso nomine mentiuntur*). It is improbable that such a statement would have found place in an official document emanating from the Roman Curia with reference to contemporary Italian sects, unless at that time some sort of relationship was known to have been established between the anti-churchly Humiliati and the followers of Peter Waldo.

3. *Early Evangelical Movements in the Netherlands and the Rhine Valley.*

LITERATURE: Hahn, "*Gesch. d. Ketzer im M. A.*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 459, *seq.*, and 463, *seq.*; Schmidt, "*Hist. et. Doctr. de la Secte des Cathares*," Vol. I., p. 48, *seq.*; Lea, "Hist. of the Inquisition," Vol. I., p. 64, *seq.*; Gieseler, "Eccl. Hist.," Vol. II., p. 532, *seq.*; Müller, "*Kirchengesch.*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 495, *seq.*

(1) *Tanchelm* (1115–1124), a contemporary of Peter de Bruys, preached with enthusiasm and success in the Netherlands. Multitudes thronged his discourses and treated him like a king. He denounced the churches as brothels; denied that the priestly consecration in the Supper was of any value,—their rites being pollutions rather than sacraments; insisted that the virtue of sacraments depends upon the character of the administrator, and dissuaded the people from receiving the eucharist at the hands of the priests and from paying tithes for their support. He is charged with claiming to be equal to Christ in sanctity and in the possession of the plenitude of the Holy Spirit. His disciples are said to have held him in such reverence that they drank the water in which he bathed. These reports have the appearance of gross exaggerations. Apart from the fanaticism that seems to be involved in these charges, his teaching seems to have closely resembled that of Peter de Bruys.

(2) *Eudo de Stella* (d. *c.* 1148), preached with like fervor in Brittany. He was of noble birth, but is said to have been illiterate. He is charged with having made fanatical claims regarding his divine commission to reform Christendom. The people were attracted to him in great numbers and followed him, it is said, as if he had been the Lord of lords. Under the influence of his violent denunciations of ecclesiastical corruptions the people went forth destroying churches and monasteries. The civil authorities long sought in vain to apprehend him. In 1148 he was seized and was condemned to perpetual imprisonment by the council of Rouen under Pope Eugenius III. He probably died soon afterward.

The following description of the heresy that abounded in this region by Hugo, archbishop of Rouen (1145), is thought to refer to the teachings of Eudo and his disciples: "The sacraments profit only the intelligent, not the ignorant; they profit adults, they bestow nothing upon little children. They condemn the baptism of little children and infants and say: 'In the gospel we read, *Whosoever shall have believed*, etc.; but little children do not believe. Therefore baptisms do not profit little children.' Again: 'If justification is of faith and salvation is of baptism, what does confirmation, made by the hand of a pontiff, add to those who believe and have been baptized, to those who are justified and saved?'"

(3) Similar bands of dissenters appeared at about the same time in the Rhenish provinces. About 1115 a number of heretics, among them two presbyters, were brought before the authorities at Treves. They denied the transmutation of the bread and the wine into the body and blood of Christ in the hands of the priests, "nor did they say that the sacrament of baptism profits little children unto salvation." The reporter charged them with having taught many other erroneous things that he thought it wrong to record.

In a letter to Bernard (1146), Evervin, provost at Steinfeld, describes certain Catharistic heretics that infested the neighborhood of Cologne and carefully distinguished from these, as "absolutely at variance with them, certain other heretics in our land":

> They deny that the body of Christ is made at the altar, on the ground that all the priests of the church are not consecrated. For the apostolic dignity, they say, has been corrupted, implicating itself in secular affairs; and in the chair of Peter not fighting with God, as did Peter, it has deprived itself of the power of consecrating, which was given to Peter. . . And so they make void the priesthood of the church, and condemn the sacraments, except baptism alone, and this in adults, who, they say, are baptized by Christ, whoever may be the administrator of the sacrament. In the baptism of little children they have no confidence on account of that gospel passage: "Whosoever shall have believed," etc. They are further represented as rejecting marriage unless both parties are virgins, as repudiating the suffrages of the saints and fasts and other afflictions for sins, and as calling "superstitions" all observances in the church that "Christ and his apostles have not established." They rejected the doctrine of purgatory, maintaining "that immediately after they go forth from the body souls pass either into eternal rest or eternal punishment."

4. *The Waldenses.*

LITERATURE: Waldensian documents published in Leger, Hahn, Herzog, etc.; "*Rescriptum Heresiarcharum Lombardie ad Pau-*

peres de Lugduno qui sunt in Alamania," recently discovered and edited by Preger—a most important document; Bernhard, "*Adv. Waldensium Sectam*" (*Max. Bib.* XXIV.); Alanus ab Insulis, "*Summa quadripartita adv. Hær.*"; Walter Mapes, of Oxford, "*De Secta Waldensium*" (in Hahn, Vol. II., p. 257, *seq.*); Petrus Vall. Sern., "*Hist. Albigensium*" (in Duchesne); Stephanus de Borbonne (in D'Argentré, I.); Rainerius, "*Summa de Catharis et Leonistis seu Pauperibus de Lugduno*" (Martène *et* Durand, V.); Moneta, "*Adv. Catharos et Waldenses*"; "*De Hær. Pauper. de Lugduno*" (in Martène *et* Durand, V.); Limborch, "*Liber Sententiarum Inquisitionis Tolosanæ*"; Hahn, "*Gesch. d. Waldenser*"; Dieckhoff, "*Die Waldenser*"; Herzog, "*Die Romanischen Waldenser*"; Preger, "*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Waldesier im Mittelalter*," 1875, "*Der Tractat des David von Augsburg über die Waldesier*," 1878, "*Ueber das Verhältnis der Taboriten zu den Waldesiern des XIV. Jahrhunderts*," 1887, "*Ueber die Verfassung der französischen Waldesier in den älteren Zeit*," 1890; Müller, "*Die Waldenser und ihre einzelnen Gruppen bis zum Anfang des XIV. Jahrhunderts*" (first published in the "*Theol. Studien und Kritiken*," 1886, *Heft* IV., and 1887, *Heft* I.), Review of writings of Keller, Haupt, and Jostes on the "*Codex Teplensis*," in the "*Theol. Studien und Kritiken*," *Heft* II., 1886, and *Heft* III., 1887; Haupt, "*Die religiösen Sekten in Franken vor der Reformation*," 1882, "*Die deutsche Bibelübersetzung der mittelalterlichen Waldenser*," 1885, "*Der Waldensische Ursprung des Codex Teplensis und der vorlutherischen deutschen Bibeldrucke*," 1886, "*Waldensia*" (in "*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*," *Bd.* X., *Heft.* II., 1888), "*Waldenserthum und Inquisition im südöstlichen Deutschland*," 1890; Keller, "*Die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien*," 1885, "*Die Waldenser und die Deutschen Bibelübersetzungen. Nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte der Reformation*," 1886, "*Zur Geschichte der Altevangelischen Gemeinden. Vortrag, gehalten zu Berlin am 20 April, 1887*," 1887, "*Johann von Staupitz und die Anfänge der Reformation*," 1888; W. Wattenbach, "*Ueber die Inquisition gegen die Waldenser in Pommern und der Mark Brandenburg*," 1886; Comba, "*Valdo ed i Valdesi avanti la Riforma*," 1880, "*Storia della Riforma in Italia narrata col Sussidio di Nuovi Documenti*," 1881, "*Histoire des Vaudois d'Italie depuis leurs Origines jusqu'a nos Jours. Primière Partie: Avant la Réforme*," 1887 (also Eng. tr. "The Waldenses of Italy, from their Origin to the Reformation," London, 1888); Döllinger, "*Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*," *1 Theil*: "*Geschichte der Gnostisch-Manichäischen Sekten*"; *2 Theil*: "*Dokumente vornehmlich zur Geschichte der Valdesier und Katharer*," 1890; Lea, "A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages," New York, 1888, *passim*; C. Douais, "*Practica Inquisitionis Heretice Pravitatis, Auctore Bernardo Guidonis Ordinis Fratrum Predicatorum. Document publíe pour la première fois*," Paris, 1886; Friess, "*Patarener, Begharden und Waldenser in Oesterreich während des Mittelalters*," 1872; Knatz, "*Vaudois et Taborites*," 1889; Fredericq, "*Corpus Documentorum Inquisitionis Neerlandicæ*," 1889; Duverger, "*L'Inquisition en Belgique*," 1888; Goll, "*Die Waldenser im Mittelalter und ihre Literatur*" (in "*Mittheilungen des Inst. für Oesterr. Gesch.*," *Bd.* IX., 1888), "*Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Böhmischen Brüder*," Prag, 1878–1882; Klimesch, "*Der Codex Teplensis*," 1881–1884; Jostes, "*Die Waldenser und die vor-*

lutherische deutsche Bibelübersetzungen," 1885, "*Die Tepler Bibelübersetzung. Eine zweite Kritik*," 1886; Weiss, "*Untersuchungen zur Bestimmung des Dialectes des Codex Teplensis*," 1887; Rachel, "*Ueber die Freiberger Bibelhandschrift nebst Beiträgen zur Gesch. d. vorlutherischen Bibelübersetzung*," 1886; S. Berger, "*La Bible Française au Moyen Age*," 1884; Montet, "*Histoire Littéraire des Vaudois du Piemont*," Paris, 1885; Kolde, "*J. von Staupitz, ein Waldenser und ein Wiedertäufer*" ("*Zeitsch. f. Kirchengesch.*," 1885); W. Böhm, "*Friedrich Reiser's 'Reformation des K. Sigmund*,'" 1876; Tocco, "*L' Eresia nel Medio Evo*," 1884; F. Palacky, "*Ueber die Beziehungen und das Verhältnis der Waldenser zu den ehemiligen Sekten in Böhmen*," 1869; Möller, Review of Preger's "*Ueber die Verfassung der französischen Waldesier*," and of Haupt's "*Waldenserthum und Inquisition im südöstlichen Deutschland*," in "*Theologische Litteratur-Zeitung*," No. 15, 1891; L. Lemme, Review of Keller's "*J. von Staupitz und die Anfänge der Reformation*," in "*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*," *Heft* I., 1890; Melia, "The Origin, Persecutions, and Doctrines of the Waldenses," 1870.

(1) *Origin of the Waldenses.* According to early accounts, the founder of the sect was Peter Waldo, a wealthy merchant of Lyons, who, from curiosity to know the contents of the Scriptures, which he was accustomed to hear in Latin, employed two priests, the one to translate, and the other to copy into the vernacular, large portions of the Scriptures. It is probable that he was already inclined to make the Scriptures his guide. Certainly, when he came to a knowledge of scriptural truth he was not slow to put it into practice. Following the command given by Christ, when sending forth the Seventy, and in view of Christ's expressions with regard to the danger of wealth to the Christian life, Peter distributed his means to the poor, secured numerous followers, and, both personally and through his disciples, taught the Scriptures to all that would hear throughout that region, urging them to turn from their sins (*c.* 1170).

The Archbishop of Lyons forbade their preaching, on the ground that they were laymen; but they replied: "We must obey God rather than men." When the archbishop insisted upon a cessation of their work, they appealed to Pope Alexander III. (1179), sending him some of their translated books. Alexander commended their poverty, but refused to come between them and the archbishop. They continued to teach and preach, and appealed to Lucius III., successor to Alexander (1183). At the synod of Verona they were excommunicated (1184).

They now assumed a more decidedly hostile attitude toward the hierarchical church, and through their evangelical zeal spread rapidly all over the South of France and Piedmont, and into Italy, Spain, the Rhine Valley, etc.

Even as late as 1212 some of the Waldenses appealed to Innocent III., who gave them permission at Metz to assemble and read the Scriptures.

It is probable that Peter Waldo had been to some extent affected by the evangelical life developed in connection with the labors of Peter de Bruys and Henry of Lausanne, though there is no evidence that he entered into any relations with these. He was content to carry on his evangelistic work within the church. His object at first was to reform the church by teaching the Scriptures and preaching the gospel to the common people in their own language. If the church had allowed him this liberty, he would probably not have become a separatist.

(2) *The Poor Men of Lyons, the Poor Men of Lombardy, their Relations to Each Other, and to the German and Austrian Evangelical Parties.* We have decisive proof that the followers of Peter Waldo entered into relations of some kind with some evangelical party in Lombardy. According to the "Rescript of the Heresiarchs of Lombardy to the Poor Men of Lyons who are in Germany,"[1] a convention was held at Bergamo, Lombardy, in 1218, between representatives of the Poor Men of Lombardy and the Poor Men of Lyons or followers of Peter Waldo, for the purpose of endeavoring to harmonize differences that had arisen between the two parties. From this document it is evident that the Waldenses had some time before formed a more or less closely cemented union with an evangelical party that they found already in Italy.

The chief points of difference were as follows: *a.* The Italians, like Arnold and his followers, insisted that the validity of the sacraments depends on the character of the person administering them; the Waldenses attributed the efficacy to the words of consecration.

b. The Italians insisted on the toleration of "congregations of workmen" for such as preferred this mode of life; while the Waldenses were strenuous in their demand for the abolition of such congregations. In this they doubtless reflected the opinion of Waldo himself, who had opposed this institution because of its incompatibility with the enthusiastic evangelism for which he stood. It is probable, as the Italians seem to admit, that the life of these institutions was far below the standard required by the Poor Men of Lyons and that reform was urgently needed. These congregations of workmen were probably heretical Humiliati.

---

[1] "*Rescriptum Heresiarchum Lombardie ad Pauperes de Lugduno, qui sunt in Alamania,*" written about 1230 or earlier, and first edited by Preger in 1875.

These two points of difference furnish a highly probable ground for the conclusion reached by Preger (and in this conclusion Breyer and Karl Müller concur), that the party of Italians that entered into relationship with the followers of Waldo represents a blending of Arnoldist with Humiliatist elements. If this conclusion is accepted as valid, the thoroughgoing Protestantism of the Arnoldists, otherwise probable, is strongly confirmed. Since the publication of Döllinger's volume of documents, we are able to speak more positively than was possible before as to the early relations of the Poor Men of Lombardy and the Poor Men of Lyons. According to a writing called "*Supra Stella*" (1235), certain Italian brethren, under John Roncho, separated themselves from the Poor Men of Lyons. The mention of Roncho as the leader of the Lombardy party enables us to identify the Runcarians, mentioned by David of Augsburg as, along with the Poor Men of Lyons, the Ortidiebarians, the Arnoldists, and the Waldenses, having formerly constituted one sect with the Italian party of the "*Rescriptum.*"

The "*Rescriptum*" and the "*Supra Stella*," mentioned in the preceding section, when taken in connection with statements of David of Augsburg and of an anonymous writer in Martène and Durand,[1] show that the followers of Peter Waldo had, soon after the beginning of his reformatory career, formed a union more or less complete with certain evangelical Christians in Lombardy; that the union was soon dissolved (1205) owing to serious differences of view; that representatives of the two parties met in convention at Bergamo in 1218 with a view to harmonizing these differences; that some time afterward, when the "*Rescriptum*" was written, the breach is as far as ever from being healed; and that at the date of the writing of "*Supra Stella*" (1235) the two parties are still recognized as distinct.

c. Another point at issue was that of a general superintendency. The Italians had asked to be assured as to the position of the Ultramontanes. Waldo, they had been informed, had strongly opposed the appointment during his lifetime or after his death of a general superintendent (*prepositus*), and they had asked to be informed whether the Ultramontanes were resolved to adhere to this position. The Ultramontanes had expressed a willingness to meet with the Italians and in co-operation with them to elect superintendents for life or rectors for a time, as might be thought more useful to the community of believers or more in the interest of peace. The Italians, it would seem, had adopted the former practice, the Ultramontanes the latter. The practice of the two parties in the matter of appointing and ordaining ministers was likewise at variance, the Italians appointing for life, the Ultramontanes for a limited time.

---

[1] *Omnes Pauperes utriusque sectæ eundem modum consecrandi tenebant . . . ante divisionem quæ fuit inter eos.*

d. The next question regards baptism. To certain inquiries of the Ultramontanes the Italians had replied: "We say that no one rejecting baptism of material waters can be saved, least of all do we believe that children not truly baptized are saved, and this we beseech them (the Ultramontanes) to believe and acknowledge." The Ultramontanes had mildly assented to this position in the following words: "We believe that no one is saved unless he shall have been baptized materially in water."

e. As regards the permanence of the married relation the Italians had expressed themselves thus: "We believe that no one ought to separate those lawfully married except for cause of fornication or by the consent of both parties." The Ultramontanes expressed a somewhat laxer view as follows: lawful wedlock "should not be dissolved except through the will of both parties, unless, in the opinion of the congregation of believers, just occasion should intervene."

The Poor Men of Lyons insisted upon the celibacy of the inner circle of evangelists, and did not hesitate to dissolve the marriage relation in favor of evangelism, which they emphasized above everything else.

On the foregoing points the two parties, though they were not entirely at one, were able to come to a good understanding. On two points they failed to reach a satisfactory basis of agreement.

f. The Ultramontanes insisted that the Italians should acknowledge that Waldo and Vivetus (one of his chief co-laborers) "are in God's Paradise," and made such acknowledgment an indispensable condition of peace. The Italians would go no further than to say that "if before their death Waldo and Vivetus satisfied God for all their faults and offenses, they could be saved."

Six representatives of each party had held a prolonged conference over this question without reaching a more satisfactory result. The significance of this contention about Waldo and Vivetus has been pointed out in an instructive way by Müller. The probability is that Waldo had recently died and that his death was the occasion of the efforts to reunite the parties. The "faults and offenses" referred to would doubtless denote the Italians' view of the proceedings of Waldo and others that led to the schism.

g. The other point of serious difference was with regard to the Eucharist. Both parties believed in the real presence, apparently in transubstantiation. The question at issue was, whether transubstantiation takes place through the simple utterance of the divine words, so that even a Jew, a heathen, or a harlot can work the change; or whether it takes place only in answer to the sincere prayer of a believer who has been set apart for the administration of the ordinances. The Ultramontanes held to the former view, the Italians to the latter. The Ultramontanes based their contention on the theory that the administration of baptism and that of the Supper are to be placed on the same level. Both parties admitted that even a harlot could in an emergency validly baptize; if so, said the Ultramontanes, why could she not validly administer the Supper?

Such are the chief points of agreement and difference between the two parties, according to this interesting and important document. It must be confessed that neither party is as evangelical, according to this document, as we would fain regard it. Of the two parties the Italian is clearly the more anti-Catholic. Both alike hold to infant baptism; both alike insist on the necessity of water baptism to salvation—the Italians more emphatically than the Ultramontanes; both hold to transubstantiation, or something bordering on it, the Ultramontanes placing the transubstantiating efficacy in the words of celebration, the Italians in the personal character of the ministrant.

(3) *The Waldenses as Represented by Catholic Writers, about 1260.* Fortunately we are not wholly dependent on the "*Rescriptum*" for our information concerning the

Poor Men of Lyons. During the generation that followed the negotiations between the two parties a marked advance toward an evangelical position seems to have been made by both parties. Two contemporary writings are available, both describing the views and work of the Poor Men, but one representing a party more closely related to the Italian party of the "Rescript," the other to the Ultramontane party (*c.* 1260). These writings are abundantly confirmed by other documents of the immediately succeeding time.

a. The writer of the first document to be considered is designated by Preger the "Passau Anonymous." It is in connection with his work that the "Rescript" has been preserved. This is one indication of the close relationship of the Passau "Leonists" of 1260 with the Italian Poor Men of the "Rescript."

The author mentions forty-two places in the diocese of Passau that were infested with the heresy described. In twelve of these there were "schools" (conventicles) and in one of them a "bishop." He characterizes them as free from pride in the matter of attire, dressing neither luxuriously nor meanly. Their teachers are weavers and shoemakers. They avoid lying, swearing, and deceit. They are content with the necessaries of life and free from avarice. They live chastely. They are moderate in eating and drinking. They avoid all kinds of frivolous pastimes. They are all the time working, learning, or teaching. Both men and women among them commit large portions of Scripture, some of them the entire New Testament, to memory. The writer is frank enough to say that a clergyman can rarely be found who can repeat three chapters of Scripture. They labor with great caution, but very effectively, among the upper classes of the people. He gives us some interesting information as to their method of inculcating their views. He enumerates the abuses in the church that lead to heretical reaction, and a frightful exhibition of depravity this enumeration surely is.

He represents the heretics as decidedly hostile to the church and the clergy. He says that in Lombardy the heretics (meaning the same party whose presence in Austria he bewails) have more "schools" (conventicles) than the theologians and also more hearers. They dispute publicly and call the people to solemn assemblies in the market-place or in the open field. Nobody dares hinder them on account of their numbers.

A Roman Catholic document of 1398 represents the Austrian Waldenses as rejecting ninety-two points of papal doctrine and practice, and holding to thoroughly evangelical views. There is evidence, therefore, that the party in Austria became more and more evangelical, and it is certain that this party had much to do with the later evangelical movement in Bohemia and Moravia, and so with the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

b. The other Roman Catholic document which we must consider is the "Tractate of David of Augsburg,"[1] a Franciscan friar. David's writing is almost contemporary with that of the "Passau Anonymous." Like the latter he was an inquisitor, and the aim of his writing was to aid future inquisitors in detecting heresy. The heretics he has in view are the Poor Men of Lyons, whom he declares to be more noxious than others on account of their cautious methods of work, and their apparent simplicity of life and piety. He gives with some modifications the usual Roman Catholic account of the rise of the Poor Men of Lyons. He makes no mention of Waldo, but simply of "certain simple laymen" who, in a spirit of presumption, undertook "to live absolutely according to the doctrine of the gospel and to keep it perfectly to the letter." Having sought and failed to secure papal recognition, they began to claim that they were, in an especial manner, "disciples of Christ and successors of the apostles," and that "they alone were the imitators of Christ."

Having been excommunicated for presuming to teach and preach without papal authority, they "reputed that excommunication an eternal benediction to themselves, glorying in being successors of the apostles," in suffering persecution, as did the apostles, at the hands of "scribes and Pharisees."

He represents these heretics as rejecting absolutely all ecclesiastical miracles, all statutes of the church enacted after Christ's ascension, all festivals, fasts, orders, benedictions, and offices of the church, saying that these things had been introduced into the church by the clergy for avaricious ends. "They say that a man is then first baptized when he has been inducted into their heresy. But some say that baptism is of no avail to little children, inasmuch as they are not yet able actually to believe." "The sacrament of confirmation they reject, but their leaders (*magistri*) impose their hands upon their disciples instead of this sacrament." "They do not believe that the body and blood of Christ are truly present (in the Eucharist), but only blessed bread which in a certain figure is called the body of Christ." "But this (the valid administration of the Supper) some say is done only through good men, but others through all who know the words of consecration.[1] This also they celebrate in their own conventicles, reciting those words of the gospel," etc.

---

[1] This document was published in a fragmentary form by Martène and Durand in their "*Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum*," and the author was long supposed to be a Dominican friar named Yvonetus. Preger discovered the real author and published a full and critical text with prolegomena under the title, "*Der Tractat des David von Augsburg über die Waldesier*," München. 1878

"They say also that a priest who is a sinner cannot bind or loose any one, since he himself is bound by sin, and that any good and intelligent layman whatever can absolve another and impose penance."

"They say that matrimony is sworn fornication unless they live continently."

"They say that every oath, even concerning what is true, is unlawful and is a mortal sin." Yet he says they allow those whose lives are in danger, etc., to swear. "They say that it is not lawful to slay evil-doers through secular judgment."

He subjoins certain Manichæan views which he attributes to "some," but which are quite antagonistic to the rest of the views of the Waldensian party he describes.

"They say there is no purgatory, but all the dying pass immediately into heaven or hell." Accordingly they rejected prayers, offerings, etc., for the dead. So also they had no faith in prayers to departed saints, or in their intercession for believers.

"The Old Testament they do not receive for believing, but only to learn some things from it in order therewith to attack us or to defend themselves."

The fact seems to be, that they rejected the use that was made of the Old Testament by the monks and clergy of the time, in support of the persecution of heretics, concubinage, sacerdotalism, legalism, etc., and held, in David's own words, that "the gospel supervening, all old things passed away."

He mentions also the use made by them of the patristic writings in defense of their dogmas.

"But not only do the men among them teach, but also the women, because to women there is better opportunity for perverting women, that through them they may also pervert the men."

According to David, there were two classes among the Poor Men of Lyons: the "perfect" (by whom he doubtless means the masters or ministers), who practised voluntary poverty and celibacy, and who devoted themselves entirely to religious work; and the "disciples," who ministered to the temporal wants of the masters, provided places of meeting, collected congregations, and in every way strove to promote the objects of the party.[2] Our author gives an interesting account of the secret methods which they were obliged to adopt, and of the inaccessible and remote places, such as subterranean caverns, where for safety they were in the habit of holding their meetings.

---

[1] This reminds us of the controversy between the Italian and the Ultramontane brethren; yet the change of sentiment as to the nature of the ordinance is remarkable.

[2] The relation between the "perfect" and the "disciples," as David represents it,

He naïvely mentions the fact that "they do not call themselves heretics, which they are, but 'true Christians,' 'friends of God,' 'poor men of God,'" etc.

He calls attention to the existence of various parties among the heretics, and mentions four of them: The Poor Men of Lyons, the Ortidiebarians, the Arnostustians (probably the Arnoldists are meant), the Runcharians, and the Waltenses. He does not mention the particulars in which they are at variance, but says that "they all unanimously hold the church in detestation."

(4) *Church Polity of the Waldenses.* As has already appeared, the Waldenses consisted of an inner and outer circle. The inner circle (the *perfecti*, or the Poor Men proper) constituted the officers and the itinerant evangelists of the party. Only after years of training and testing were candidates admitted to the inner circle. This took place at the great annual meetings of the body (usually held in Lombardy). Renunciation of private property, celibacy, and a promise to devote themselves unreservedly to religious work, were conditions of admission. This inner circle had much in common with the monastic orders, especially with the Franciscan. The annual meeting of these initiated workers received reports of work from the entire field, received and distributed the funds collected during the year, appointed each worker to his sphere of labor, admitted candidates into the ranks of the *perfecti*, appointed and consecrated the general superintendent, elders, and deacons, as occasion arose, disciplined or excluded the unworthy, etc. The organization combined the features of a connectional church and a missionary society. The general superintendent, usually appointed for life, was virtually the monarchical head of the body. Presbyters and deacons constituted the other ranks of their three-fold ministry.

---

is very similar to that which subsisted between the various monastic orders and the Tertiaries of these orders. These Tertiaries were very general after the rise of the Dominican and Franciscan orders.

Bernard Guy[1] gives in an apparently authentic form full information regarding the three-fold ministry and the methods of appointing and consecrating members of each rank. He supposes the possible presence of another bishop (*major*) at the ordination of a bishop. It is probable that at certain epochs, if not throughout the later Middle Ages, the territory covered by Waldensian work was subdivided into two or more provinces. There are some other indications of such subdivision. It is possible that bishops disabled by age and infirmities sometimes retired from the active superintendency and assisted in choosing and setting apart their successors.

Each newly appointed evangelist was obliged to travel for years in company with an experienced man before he was allowed to itinerate independently. Waldensian evangelists became familiar with all of the by-ways and became experts in disguising themselves and evading their persecutors.

Hospices, presided over usually by elderly women, were maintained by the society in each center of work, for the entertainment of itinerant preachers and as places of meeting for the outer circle. The organization of the body was so complete that it was possible, even in times of dire persecution, to carry forward the work with considerable vigor. The trade guilds were no doubt in many cases largely under their influence and furnished important aid for their propaganda.

As a means of avoiding detection the Waldenses usually allowed themselves to conform outwardly, as far as seemed necessary, to the Roman Catholic Church. In many cases they had their infants baptized by the priests and occasionally attended mass. When brought before the Inquisition a large proportion usually recanted, but the inquisitors soon learned that such recantation amounted to nothing and that they almost invariably relapsed.

(5) *Concluding Remarks*. *a*. From the materials that have been presented it appears that Waldo and his immediate followers differed little from enthusiastic churchly reformers like Dominic and Francis, who secured recognition from the hierarchy and constituted monastic orders. When freedom to teach was refused them they repudiated church authority and followed their religious impulses. It was some time after Waldo's death, and after his followers had come into influential contact with the more radical reformers of an earlier type, that they attained to a thoroughly evangelical position.

b. The Waldenses, like most of the churchly and non-churchly reforming parties of the Middle Ages, were anti-Augustinian in their theological conceptions. They laid especial stress on the direct teachings and the example of our Lord. The Sermon on the Mount they interpreted somewhat literally and attempted to carry out its precepts in their lives. On this ground they rejected oaths, warfare, magistracy, capital punishment, and usually even the right of self-defense. They laid great stress on suffering for and with Christ as a test of true discipleship. Private property, especially in the case of the inner circle, was renounced. Marriage was thought to be inconsistent with unreserved devotion to evangelistic work and was even dissolved in favor of such work. The ascetical principle was not carried by them to the extreme reached in monasticism, asceticism being regarded by them not as an end in itself but as a means to the great end of evangelizing the world.

---

[1] *"Practica Inquisitionis,"* ed. Douais, p. 136, *seq.*

c. From the middle of the thirteenth century onward the Waldenses and related parties seem to have repudiated the papal church with all its corruptions and departures from New Testament Christianity, and to have earnestly striven for the realization of apostolic simplicity and purity. They rejected the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation and insisted that Christ is present in the bread and the wine only spiritually. Many of them rejected infant baptism, as did Peter de Bruys and most of the evangelicals whom we meet in the twelfth century before Waldo. The New Testament was their text-book and even the women and children mastered it in a manner that surprised the ignorant priests of the time. This they circulated in vernacular versions.

The "*Codex Teplensis*," discovered a few years ago in a Bohemian monastery, has been proved to be a copy of an early Waldensian version and to represent the text of the earliest German printed Bible. Romance versions have also been preserved.[1]

d. It is impossible to form any well-assured estimate as to the numbers of the Waldenses and related parties during the later Middle Ages. But we have enough facts to justify a belief that they existed in nearly every part of Europe and that their adherents numbered tens, if not hundreds, of thousands. The fifteenth century was highly favorable for the spread of the old evangelical Christianity because of the continued and flagrant corruption of the papal church and the relaxation of the work of the

---

[1] See the author's "Recent Researches Conc. Med. Sects," p. 215, *seq*.

Inquisition. It was unfavorable to the preservation of historical data regarding their work precisely because of the lethargy of the authorities to whose inquisitorial proceedings we are chiefly indebted for information.

5. *The Taborites.*

Be prepared [illegible]

LITERATURE: Krummel, "*Utraquisten u. Taboriten*"; Preger, "*Ueber d. Verhältnis d. Taboriten zu d. Waldesiern d. XIV. Jahrh.*"; Palacky, "*Ueber d. Beziehungen u. d. Verhältnis d. Waldenser zu d. ehemaligen Sekten in Böhmen*"; Zezschwitz, "*D. Katechismen d. Waldenser u. Böhmischen Brüder*"; Gindely, "*Gesch. d. Böhm. Brüder*"; Bezold, "*Zur Gesch. d. Husitismus*"; Haupt, "*Waldenserthum u. Inquisition im südöstlichen Deutschland*"; Loserth, "*Beiträge zur Gesch. d. Husitischen Bewegung*"; Goll, "*Quellen u. Untersuchungen zur Gesch. d. Böhm. Brüder*," esp. Part II., pp. 47–64.

The Taborites represent the extreme democratic and religious development in connection with the Hussite movement in Bohemia. Owing to the fearful persecution to which they were subjected, the Taborites came to despair of the resources that are available for Christians under the present dispensation and to take refuge in millenarian expectations. But fundamentally they were so evangelical that they may properly be considered here.

(1) *Relation of the Taborites to the Waldenses.* This question has been much discussed within recent years. It has been abundantly proved by Preger and others that the Waldenses of the stricter (Italian) party were numerous and aggressive in Bohemia during the fourteenth century. Heretics supposed to have been Waldenses were so numerous in the possessions of the Baron of Neuhaus (southern Bohemia) about 1340 as to defy their Catholic adversaries, whom they are said to have threatened to destroy in case their liberties were interfered with. The teachings of the Taborites were almost identical with those of the more evangelical Waldenses. On the other hand, Loserth has proved the identity of most of the teachings of the Taborites with those of Wycliffe, whose writings were at this time widely circulated in Bohemia and whose thoughts had been popularized by Huss. It seems best to suppose that these two sets of influences were combined in the Taborite movement.

(2) *Sketch of the Movement.* The execution of John Huss and Jerome of Prague by the council of Constance (1415) and the measures adopted by the council for the extirpation of heresy from Bohemia, led to a popular uprising under the leadership of Nicholas of Hussinetz and John Ziska. Mount Tabor became their chief stronghold and thousands gathered there to enjoy religious privileges and to resist their enemies (1419). The ecclesiastical leaders of Prague were inclined to make the best compromise they could with the imperial and papal authorities. This exasperated the radicals, who, under Ziska, marched upon Prague and administered terrible chastisement. The death of King Wenceslaus and the refusal of the Bohemians to submit to the Emperor Sigismund threw the country into anarchy. The Taborites formulated their teachings, constituted themselves into a theocracy, and for years resisted the efforts of the Catholics and of the Hussites to subdue them. They remind us of the Paulicians in the fierceness with which they resisted their oppressors and in their iconoclastic zeal, as well as in the evangelical character of their teachings. For years they carried on a devastating warfare. The terrible stress of conflict with the powers of Antichrist drove many of the Taborites into a fanatical expectation of special divine interposition and of the setting up of a millennial kingdom through the sword of Gideon.

In 1433 peace was made between the Hussites and the Catholics. For a number of years the Taborites enjoyed a measure of freedom under Sigismund. After many efforts at conciliation on the part of the dominant party they were conquered and scattered by George Podiebrad (1453). They ceased from this time to exist as an organized party, but many congregations long continued to propagate their radical reformatory views in secret and many of the more moderate were absorbed by the Bohemian Brethren.

(2) *Doctrines and Practices of the Taborites.* *a.* The Taborites were just as decided as the Italian Waldenses in their rejection of the apocryphal Scriptures, of tradition, and of ecclesiastical authority, and in their assertion of the sole and absolute authority of the canonical Scriptures in matters of faith and practice. In their Confession of

Faith of 1420 it is asserted, "That no written or spoken statements of any doctors whatsoever are to be held or universally (*catholice*) believed, except what are explicitly contained in the canon of the Bible," and that "no decrees of the holy fathers or institutions of the elders, no rites of any sort or tradition humanly invented, are to be held; but all such things are to be abolished and destroyed as traditions of Antichrist." The Masters of Prague, or the Hussites proper, were just as explicit in their denial of this principle: "Let no one dare to say that only those things are to be believed for faith or otherwise held that are expressed and explicitly posited in Sacred Scripture," etc.

b. Like the Waldenses of all parties in the later time, and those of the Italian party from the beginning, the Taborites believed their own sect to constitute the true church of Christ, in which alone salvation was to be found, regarded the Roman Catholic Church as "the church of the malignant and of the beast and of the harlot," as "the house of lies," and maintained that "all Catholics, little children alone excepted, are worthy of damnation," etc.

c. As regards the ordinances, the Taborites took a position, in most respects, alongside of the more advanced of the Waldenses. They maintained that "no chrism, or sacred oil, or baptismal water ought to be consecrated or sanctified." They rejected the use of exorcism, and maintained the sufficiency of any fresh water, anywhere, for baptismal purposes. In one respect alone they seem to have been less radical than the most radical of the Waldenses, namely, in the retention of infant baptism. Their theory and practice in reference to the Supper were equally at variance with Roman Catholic and Hussite, and equally accordant with the most advanced Waldensian theory and practice. They rejected the entire body of ceremonies that had grown up in connection with the mass, insisting on the use of an ordinary unconsecrated cup and simple bread, and making the validity of the ordinance, thus simply administered, independent of consecrated places. They rejected transubstantiation and consubstantiation alike, and held to the spiritual presence of Christ in the devout celebration of the ordinance.

[illegible] the Bible.

d. Like the Petrobrusians and the Waldenses, they rejected with the utmost decision all ecclesiastical fasts and festivals, except such as have apostolic sanction, and ecclesiastical chanting and all liturgical devices, and repudiated the doctrines of purgatory, prayers for the dead, intercession of saints, the veneration of relics, shrines, images, etc. They agreed with the Waldenses and earlier evangelical parties in condemning all forms of luxury and frivolity in food, drink, dress, social intercourse, etc., insisting on the greatest simplicity and purity of life. Like the Waldenses of all parties they rejected oaths.

6. *Marsilius of Padua.*

LITERATURE: His "*Defensor Pacis*" (first printed at Basel, 1522, then at Frankfurt, 1598, and more recently in Goldast, "*Monarchia Sancti Rom. Imperii*," Vol. II., pp. 154–312, copious extracts in Gieseler, "Eccl. Hist.," Vol. III., pp. 29–33); Lechler, "*J. von Wiclif*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 107, *seq.*; Riezler, "*Die literar. Widersacher d. Päpste zur Zeit Ludwigs d. Bayers*," *Seit.* 30, *seq.*, 76, *seq.*, 122, *seq.*, 193–240; Müller, "*Der Kampf Ludwigs d. Bay. mit d. Rom. Kurie*," *Bd.* I., *Seit.* 161, *seq.*, *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 159, *seq.*, etc.; Meyer, "*Etude sur Marsile de Padoue*"; Jourdan, "*Etude sur Marsile de Padoue*," 1892; Sullivan, "Marsiglio of Padua and William of Ockam" (in "Am. Hist. Rev.," Apr. and Jul., 1897); articles in Herzog-Hauck and Lichtenberger.

(1) *Sketch of Marsilius.* Marsilius of Padua, rector of the University of Paris (1312), espoused the cause of the Emperor Louis the Bavarian against Pope John XXII. (1323 onward), and wrote, in collaboration with John of Jandun, the "*Defensor Pacis*" (1324), in which he set forth views in almost every respect thoroughly in accord with those of the Waldenses and related parties, with a philosophical insight that was for the most part foreign to the evangelical teachers. For years he was court physician to the emperor and no doubt powerfully influenced the sentiments and the policy of his patron. The friends of the excommunicated emperor treated the hierarchy with the utmost contempt. In some cases the clergy were driven out of the cities and otherwise abused, and a large measure of freedom was given to the various forms of dissent.

(2) *Views of Marsilius.* Marsilius insisted on the exclusive authority of the canonical Scriptures naturally

interpreted by the consensus of believers, without priestly interference. "For defining doubtful opinions regarding the divine law a general council of believers, and not any kind of partial body of men or any individual person of whatever condition he may be, ought to be solely authoritative." "There is no gospel precept for compelling any one by pains and penalties to observe the precepts of the divine law." "The precepts of the new divine law alone (the New Testament), and the things that are necessarily involved in these," and "by no means all the precepts of the ancient law," are obligatory for Christians. "In regard to the divine precepts or prohibitions of the new law no one can grant dispensation." To prohibit things permitted by the New Testament belongs only to a general council or to a Christian civil legislator. "The sole human legislator is the entire body of the citizens, or the stronger part (*valentiorem partem*) thereof." "Decretals or decrees of Roman pontiffs or of any pontiffs whatsoever, unitedly or dividedly, constituted without the concession of the human legislator (a majority of the citizens) oblige no one to inflict or suffer temporal pains and penalties." "To excommunicate any one or to interdict the performance of religious services, without the authority of the Christian legislator, is lawful for no bishop or priest or body of them." "All bishops are of equal authority, immediately through Christ." He insists on the right of other bishops to excommunicate the bishop of Rome, denies the right of the latter to promote men to ecclesiastical dignities, urges the right of the people as the sole legislators to determine the number of churches and church officials that shall be maintained, and the right of the human legislator (the people) to use the revenues from ecclesiastical property for purposes of public utility and defense as well as for charitable and purely religious purposes. It belongs to a general council alone to prohibit the marriage of the clergy, if this be thought expedient. He insists that the terms "presbyter" and "bishop" were synonymous in the primitive church, the former having reference to age, the latter to dignity or to watchcare over others. He repudiated the claim of the Roman church to be the *Cathedra Petri*, or to have any superiority over other churches. As regards Peter he denies that there is any scriptural proof that he was bishop of the Roman church or even that he ever visited Rome. Paul rather than Peter was indubitably a Roman bishop. Peter was bishop of Antioch. He explains intelligently the rise of the papal power and its growth until it reached the arrogance of Boniface VIII. and his successors.

7. *Peter Chelcicky.*

LITERATURE: Goll, "*Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Gesch. d. Böhm. Brüder*," *Theil* II. (an excellent exposition of Chelcicky's teachings, with copious extracts from his writings). See also the Literature on the Bohemian Brethren.

(1) *Sketch.* Peter, called Chelcicky from his native town Chelcic, in Bohemia, was born about 1385. Nothing is known of his earlier life, or of his educational advantages. We first meet him in Prague about 1419, when he protested vehemently against the proposal of Nicholas of Hussinetz and John of Ziska to take up arms in defense of religious freedom. He was one of the foremost thinkers and popular writers of the fifteenth century, and was deeply indebted to the writings of Wycliffe and Huss, to the Waldenses, and probably to the Taborites. He has been fittingly called the spiritual father of the Bohemian Brethren. For years he sustained intimate relations with Rokycana, the leader of the Utraquist Hussites.

(2) *His Teachings and Influence.* In a far more emphatic way than Marsilius, he contrasts the old law with the new. In his discussion with Rokycana, the head of the Hussite party that had compromised with Rome, he shows the utter inadmissibility of defending hierarchical church government by connecting it with the sacerdotal system of the Old Testament. The old law was corporeal and had to be observed according to the letter. It is otherwise with the new law. This is spiritual, and is embraced in a few words, in which, however, great things are implicitly contained. It has nothing in common with men who do not possess God's wisdom and Christ's spirit. He repudiates with decision all prelatical or churchly authority.

The only source of faith, according to Chelcicky, is the will of God as made known authoritatively and exhaustively, once for all, through the apostles in the New Testament Scriptures. The idea of development or of change by church authority was intolerable to him. This law of God is absolutely sufficient in all things. Christians live in the State, but have no part in it. They must not bring their disputes for decision before worldly magistrates. Apostasy began when the relations of Church and State changed. If all the heathen who by baptism became nominally Christian had become such in reality, the State would thereby have ceased to exist; for its whole organism would have become unnecessary and superfluous. For non-Christian people the State is necessary, but it is a necessary evil; the greater evil, however, is the so-called Christian State; the greatest of all the civil power in its union with the church. Before the union of Church and State, under Constantine, Christians lived under heathen; since that time good and true Christians live under bad ones. The only advantage he can see in this arrangement for true Christians is that thereby they have an opportunity to endure suffering and so to confirm their faith. The very expression "Christian State" involves an insoluble contradiction. It is Christian only in name, for it belongs to the essence of the State to use compulsion and violence, which is completely foreign to the spirit of Christianity. In seeking to reconcile the State and Christianity Augustine sucked blood, instead of milk, from Scripture. All dominion, all class divisions, he regarded as a violation of Christ's command of brotherly equality (Luke 22 : 24–27). Equality and brotherhood he considered fundamental requirements of God's law, and he was able to conceive of no form of civil government in which these could be realized. Like most of the old evangelicals of the Middle Ages, and like the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, he rejected, along with magistracy, as a Christian institution, oaths, warfare, and capital punishment.

He laid great emphasis upon the imitation of Christ, but did not lose sight of his atoning work. Christ is not only teacher and exemplar, but also Saviour and eternal Mediator between the creature and the Creator. Through his blood he has cleansed the human race from sin and as high priest stands continually before God to intercede for believers.

Man's will even after the fall has remained free. Good and evil stand before it: choose! Only the freely chosen good is truly good and valuable. Yet man does not attain to this choice without God's help. Inner regeneration cannot be introduced without God's grace, nor can the will of man be brought into harmony with the divine will. It is the inner regeneration that gives man a new heart, a new understanding, new thoughts, new works. He derives salvation from God's grace alone; yet so that man is not passive but active in the appropriation of it. Good works are to be performed not of compulsion, not from fear of hell, but from love to God. The idea of meriting salvation he regarded as absurd. No man in this life can be perfectly well pleasing to God. As Christ transformed water into wine, so our imperfect works may be transformed so as to be found sufficient. On Christ's death and the grace of God alone rests our hope of salvation.

Chelcicky recognized only two sacraments, in the strict sense, baptism and the Supper. Regarding the former, after quoting the Great Commission, he proceeds:

> "Open and clear is the word of the Son of God: first he speaks of faith, then of baptism . . . and since we find this doctrine in the gospel we should now also hold fast to it. But the priests err grievously in baptizing the great mass, and no one is found whether old or young who knows God and believes his Scripture, and this is evident in their works . . . nevertheless all without discrimination are baptized and receive the body and blood of Christ. . . But we should rather hold fast to the view that baptism belongs to those who know God and believe his Scripture. . . In order to receive baptism in truth, a man must have the will to die to sin."

He regarded baptism as freeing the recipient from the guilt of hereditary sin, but not from hereditary sin itself, which remains as long as life lasts. The above teachings would seem to involve a rejection of infant baptism; but he found a place for it in his system: "If true Christians desire baptism for their children they cannot be blamed for it." Again: "If such have children, baptism should be bestowed upon their children in their (the parents') conscience."

His view of the Supper involved denial of transubstantiation and probably fell short of consubstantiation; yet he does not seem to have regarded it as a mere memorial.

He seems to teach that the body and blood of Christ are partaken of spiritually by the believer.

Chelcicky made an earnest effort to win Rokycana (archbishop elect) to his evangelical position, and was in close communication with those who organized themselves as the Bohemian Brethren (*Unitas Fratrum*). He seems not to have entered into this organization, preferring to keep aloof from parties and to conserve his wider influence as an independent teacher.

8. *The Lollards.*

who they

LITERATURE: Wilkins, "*Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*," Tom. III.; Foxe, "Acts and Monuments"; Lechler, "*Joh. von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte d. Reformation*" (Eng. trans. of part of the work by Lorimer); Green, "Hist. of the Eng. People"; Trevelyan, "England in the Age of Wycliffe."

The history of evangelical life in England before and after the time of Wycliffe has received little attention in comparison with that given to Continental parties. No doubt there is a relative sparsity of materials, due in some measure to the fact that the Inquisition was never fully established in England. It is certain that the influence of the early British and Iro-Scottish form of Christianity survived the strenuous efforts to suppress it and persisted until long after the Norman conquest. We have occasional notices of the appearance in England, in the thirteenth and fourteeth centuries, of heretics from the Continent, especially from the Netherlands. That many of the persecuted sectaries of the Continent should have taken refuge in England, where the authorities were less vigilant than in most other countries, was to be expected. The comparatively evangelical teachings of several of Wycliffe's predecessors were doubtless due in some measure to the prevalence of evangelical views among the people and in turn greatly promoted evangelical life and thought. It seems certain that in Wales and the neighboring English counties a large part of the population remained comparatively free from Roman Catholic influence. The circulation of the popular writings of Wycliffe and of his version of the Bible, and the evangelizing activity of his "Poor Priests," brought out into publicity and aggressiveness much of the older evangelical life that had long been latent and multiplied the numbers of those who would recognize no other authority in religion than the word of God.

It is remarkable that Wycliffe's followers consisted largely of the noble and educated classes. This was due in part to the fact that his reformatory teachings had a distinctively patriotic basis.

The Lollards were not hampered by Wycliffe's philosophical realism, and did not hesitate to become schismatics.

The history of the Lollards may be conveniently divided into four stages: (1) From Wycliffe's death till the elevation to the throne of the house of Lancaster (1384–1399). (2) From 1399 till the execution of Lord Cobham (1417). (3) From 1417 till the close of the persecution (1431). (4) From 1431 till the Reformation.

(1) *The Lollards until 1399.* The Lollards spread rapidly during this time. We know of many evangelists who preached with great power throughout England and Wales. It is asserted by a Roman Catholic writer of the time, that one could scarcely see two men on the road, but that one was a Wycliffite. These evangelists were also active in forming a popular literature, and many of their writings have been preserved. The most noted of these preachers and writers were Hereford, Aston, and Purvey, who, with many other Lollards, had received university training, and were thoroughly versed in Scripture. These were protected by such noblemen as John of Montacute, Count of Salisbury, Sir Thomas Latimer, Sir Thomas Trussell, and Sir Lewis Clifford. In fact, most of the gentry and many of the nobility seem to have been favorers of the new party.

In 1395 the Lollards presented a memorial to Parliament, in which it is declared that the corruption of the church is the result of pride; that the priesthood which began in Rome is not that priesthood that Christ ordained; that the law of celibacy induces unnatural vice; that the doctrine of transubstantiation leads to idolatry; that exorcisms and blessings made on wine, bread, water, wax, etc., are practices of necromancy; that prayers for the dead are a false foundation of alms;

that auricular confession exalts the pride of the priests, and gives them opportunity for secret conversations for vicious purposes; that homicide through war, or under pretence of law, is expressly contrary to the New Testament; that vows of celibacy made in the church by women are the cause of the most horrible crimes (sins); that arts that do not minister to actual wants, but to pride, should be abolished.

This memorial is of interest, as showing the boldness and zeal of the reforming party, as well as the spirit of the reform—a return to primitive simplicity and purity of doctrine and life.

The Lollards of Leicester denied the power of pope or prelates to excommunicate any one not previously excommunicated by God, or to grant indulgences. They held that any layman has a right to preach and teach the gospel anywhere; that every good man is a priest whether he knows literature or not; and that no ecclesiastic in a sinful state is able to administer ordinances validly.

In 1391 Walter Brute, a Welshman, who had studied at Oxford and had been for some time engaged in evangelistic work, was arraigned before the Bishop of Hereford. After a prolonged examination he submitted.

The following particulars with regard to the belief of the Lollards, may be learned from his statements:

He agreed with Wycliffe in putting all authority in Scripture, and in making Christ the sole head of the church. In the Lord's Supper, he held that the body and blood of Christ are present only symbolically. He rejected, as Wycliffe did not, the idea of sacrifice in the Eucharist. He denied the power of papal excommunication, the validity of ordinances performed by vicious priests, etc. He had a clear insight into the nature of the gospel and its distinction from the law. He set forth the doctrine of justification by faith far more clearly than Wycliffe had done.

We may say of the Lollards of this time, that they had attained to a position far more evangelical than that of Wycliffe. With regard to infant baptism, and the rebaptism of those baptized in the Roman Catholic Church, the writer has not found any expressions.

Up to 1395 no adequate measures had been adopted for the suppression of the reforming party. The presentation of the memorial to Parliament, the accession to the archbishopric of Canterbury of Thomas Arundel, the deposition of Richard II., and the accession of Henry IV., of the house of Lancaster (1399), led to the adoption of more rigorous measures. Archbishop Arundel was a violent opponent of the reform party, and from the beginning took the side of the house of Lancaster against Richard.

(2) *The Lollards from 1399 till 1417.* Henry IV. at once threw himself into the arms of the papists, promised the clergy immunity from taxation, and offered all needful aid in the extirpation of heresy. In 1400 an act was passed for the burning of Lollards, with full provisions for the arrest and trial of such. All unauthorized conventicles, schools, books, and preaching were to be suppressed. Under this legislation, together with other legislation in the same direction (1414), the inquisition of heresy was now pushed forward with vigor. Many Lollards were burned, especially preachers; the University of Oxford was harassed; Wycliffe's books were destroyed in large numbers.

Lord Cobham (Sir John Oldcastle), distinguished for military ability and for uprightness of character, had long been a follower of Wycliffe. He disregarded the legislation against heretics, and continued to promote evangelical preaching in his extended domain. After the death of Henry IV. (1413), Convocation brought accusation against Oldcastle, and urged Archbishop Arundel to take steps against him. This did not seem advisable to Arundel, on account of the confidential relations that existed between Oldcastle and the king. The king, having been informed of Oldcastle's heresy, had an interview with him and endeavored to persuade him to renounce his heresy. This failing, the king urged the archbishop to proceed against Oldcastle. Oldcastle protected himself for some time, but was at length brought before parliament (1417) and condemned to the stake. Up to this time the Lollard movement had been looked upon as political rather than ecclesiastical, and little notice had been taken of it outside of England. Now it came to be regarded as a heresy in the same sense in which the Waldenses were heretics. Before the death of Cobham, the party had hoped by political influence to carry out its reformatory plan. This hope was now at an end.

(3) *The Lollards after 1417.* After this time the party was driven into secrecy, and necessarily declined. From time to time Lollards were discovered, and numerous martyrdoms occurred. From 1431 onward the authorities seem to have thought that the heresy was utterly exterminated. Yet the Lollards persisted in considerable numbers till the Reformation.

9. *The Bohemian Brethren.*

LITERATURE: Besides the pertinent items in the Literature on the Taborites, Czerwenka, "*Gesch. d. Evang. Kirche im Böhmen*"; Cröger, "*Gesch. d. alten Brüderkirche*"; De Schweinitz, "The Hist. of the Church known as the *Unitas Fratrum*"; J. Müller, "*Bischofthum d. Brüderunität*," and his comprehensive account of the Brethren in Herzog-Hauck, third ed., *Bd.* III., *Seit.* 445–467.

(1) *Origin of the Party.* In general it may be said that the Bohemian Brethren embodied the thorough-going evangelical results of the Hussite movement. After the compromise of the moderate Hussite party (Utraquists or Calixtines) with Rome on the basis of the *Compactata*, which it was well understood the Roman Curia had no intention of permanently observing, and the overthrow of the Taborites that resulted from this compromise, a large number of earnest men in various parts of the country felt that something must be done for the conservation and expansion of the evangelical life that had been developed during the preceding half-century in Bohemia and Moravia. The evangelical teachings of Wycliffe and Huss had pervaded the land. The Waldenses were numerous in Bohemia and were in close contact with the still more numerous body in Austria. Their influence was widespread and profound in favor of evangelical teaching and practice.

The Taborites, though their power was broken and their membership scattered, still exercised a considerable influence in favor of radical reform. It is probable that after the failure of the Taborite theocracy a large proportion of the membership had their eyes opened to the unreality of their millenarian expectations and came to understand that the kingdom of God is not to be set up by "the sword of Gideon." The writings and the personal influence of Peter Chelcicky were highly influential in the organization of the *Unitas Fratrum*.

Rokycana as archbishop-elect of Prague wrought zealously (1448 onward) in favor of moral reform and inner piety. He had insisted that the law of God is the highest of all laws and that the lives of individuals and the civil and ecclesiastical power must be brought into subjection thereto. He had made a profound impression by the sharpness of his criticism of Catholics and Utraquists. In fact he was looked upon by the thorough-going evangelicals as one who would lead them in their struggle for the restoration of primitive Christianity.

His nephew Gregory, a young noble, adopted an ascetical mode of life and became zealous for religious reform. He was the center of a small group of enthusiasts (1453–1454), who insisted on carrying out practically the reformatory teachings of Rokycana. It was Rokycana's insistence on a spiritual ministry that had particularly impressed the Brethren. They made it their business to get into communication with all the good priests of whom they could learn and to draw them into their circle. Rokycana directed them to Peter Chelcicky, whom he had long known as one of the ablest and devoutest of religious thinkers.

In 1457–1458 they obtained through Rokycana permission from the regent, George Podiebrad, to settle in the village of Kunwald, in the province of Lititz, for the working out of their religious ideals. The people of this district were largely Taborites.

(2) *Early Organization of the Brethren and their Proceedings to 1464.* The aims of the Brethren were in many respects similar to those of the founders of monastic orders. A community in which every detail of life should be prescribed and brought into harmony with the law of Christ was their ideal. An organization was privately effected soon after their settlement at Kunwald (1457–1458). They called themselves at first "Brethren of the Law of Christ." Fearing lest this should cause them to be looked upon as monks, they afterward changed it to "Brethren," and again to "Unity of Brethren" (*Unitas Fratrum*).

They had no thought, it appears, of organizing a new church. Like John Wesley and his associates in the eighteenth century, they aimed to establish a fraternal association which should cultivate a high type of piety and should labor earnestly for the reformation of the national church. Twenty-eight elders were appointed for the spiritual guidance of the people. The names of these have been preserved.[1] Other elders or directors were added a little later.

During the years 1458–1459 the numbers of the Brethren increased. Rokycana treated them with consideration until after the election of George Podiebrad, who had for some years been regent, to the Bohemian throne.

Since 1434 Rokycana's great ambition had been to secure papal recognition of his election to the archbishopric of Prague. When this seemed utterly hopeless he became a bold reformer (as about 1454–1458. He now hoped that his friend Podiebrad might be able to make favorable terms with the papacy and it would not do for him to show friendship for the Brethren. He may be designated as the Cranmer of his time.

Difficulties arose among the Brethren about 1459 regarding the Supper, some insisting on the simple Taborite view, which denied the real presence, others holding to the Utraquist or even the Roman Catholic view (consubstantiation or transubstantiation). A compromise was reached in the adoption of Peter Chelcicky's view, which was formulated thus: "All who receive the sacrament in truth, through faith, believe and confess that it is the true body and blood of Christ, according to his word and mind without adding anything or taking away anything, and rejecting all human explanations."

Later it was resolved that the Brethren "should be satisfied with God's word and simply believe what it taught, avoiding all tracts (referring to the polemical discussions of the time); and that even such as seemed to approximate to the truth ought not to be read until they had been examined and approved by the elders." It is manifest that they were pursuing an unwise course in seeking to maintain harmony by stifling discussion. But it answered the purpose for the time. Large numbers of Taborites from Moravia united with the Brethren in 1460.

---

[1] See De Schweinitz, p. 109, *seq.*

George Podiebrad, though a liberal at heart, had accepted the crown on condition that he should be obedient to the pope and destroy all heresy. Complaints came to the throne regarding the rapid increase and the proceedings of the Brethren and of the growing influence of the Taborites in the movement. It was found that several professors and masters and many students in the University of Prague were sympathetic with the Brethren. A royal edict of banishment was issued (1461) against all who should refuse to be Utraquist or Catholic. Gregory, who was in Prague for conference with sympathizers there, was imprisoned and tortured, along with several others. The rest recanted, but he abode steadfast. Many of the Brethren were cast into prison in various places; some were burned alive. Rokycana felt obliged to acquiesce in these shameful proceedings. Only thus could he retain the favor of the king or hope to be recognized by the pope. The Brethren remonstrated with him and when they could gain no satisfaction declared: "Thou art of the world and wilt perish with the world." This angered him and he now joined more heartily in their persecution. Political complications soon afterward led the king to discontinue his persecuting measures.

(3) *The Completed Organization* (*1464–1467*). The policy of persecution pursued by Podiebrad and Rokycana convinced the Brethren that there was no place for them in the national church and that a separate church organization was a necessity. At a synod held at Reichenau in 1464 statutes were agreed upon for the government of the Brethren in all their inner and outer relations. Community of goods is not insisted upon therein, but is highly recommended; and the care of the needy and the persecuted is made a matter of Christian obligation. The type of life advocated is that of gentleness, submissiveness, helpfulness to each other and to those who are without, obedience to elders and other leaders, disregard of temporal comforts, and absorption in spiritual things. These rules are probably similar to those privately adopted in 1457–1458. Doctrinal matters are kept out of sight. The question of a complete church organization was discussed, but the time for decision was not yet. Three of the elders, Gregory, Procopius, and John

Klevonsky, were appointed chief elders for the general superintendency of the body.

The question of a separate church organization and an independent ministry continued to be a subject of prayerful consideration. Among the most earnest advocates of independent organization was Martin Lupac, who had been a Taborite and who had afterward been appointed suffragan bishop under Rokycana.

Another synod was called about 1465 for the consideration of this question. The Brethren determined to let the Lord decide the matter through the use of the lot. The lot was cast and answered affirmatively the questions: "Is it God's will that we shall separate entirely from the power of the papacy and hence from its priesthood? Is it God's will that we shall institute, according to the model of the primitive church, a ministerial order of our own?"

In 1467 a synod was held at Lhota for the completion of the organization. After Gregory had voiced the sentiments of the body in favor of the action about to be taken, a hymn of thanksgiving and praise composed for the occasion was devoutly sung. Then, in token of their separation from Rome and its corruptions, each member of the synod received a new baptism. Until 1535 the Brethren regularly rebaptized all that came to them from the Roman Catholic Church. They abandoned the practice then to avoid the odium of Anabaptism.

As the lot had convinced them that God willed the constitution of a separate church organization and a separate ministry, so they were content to leave the selection of the leaders to God speaking through the lot. First of all nine men distinguished for piety and zeal were nominated by ballot. Then twelve strips of paper, three of them marked, were placed in a vessel. After prayer for divine guidance, a lad was called in to draw out the slips and distribute them to the nominees. All three of the marked slips were drawn. Two priests, Matthias of Kunwald and Elias of Chrenovik, and Thomas of Prelouc, a layman, were the chosen. There were present two other priests, Michael of Bradacius, and an aged Waldensian. It was determined by lot that the latter should ordain the brethren who had been chosen.

Some of the brethren were dissatisfied with this merely presbyterial ordination and felt episcopal ordination to be desirable. The synod appointed a deputation to seek episcopal ordination from the Waldensian bishop Stephen, who resided in Moravia. The priest Michael was consecrated by Stephen and bestowed consecration on Matthias, from whom in turn he received it (his third consecration), and Matthias ordained again Thomas and Elias. The Waldenses claimed apostolic succession for their episcopacy and the Brethren felt that they had made their position doubly sure by adding to their Roman Catholic succession that of these old evangelicals. Michael laid down his episcopal dignity in favor of Matthias, who thus became the general superintendent of the body.

To satisfy such scruples as still remained, a deputation was sent to the far East to confer with old Christian parties and, if they were satisfied with the teachings and life of these Christians, to secure episcopal ordination from this source. But they found the Oriental churches so corrupt and unevangelical that succession through such a channel was thought undesirable.

It is apparent from the above that the church order of the Brethren, like that of the Waldenses, was connectional and episcopal. A three-fold ministry was provided for. The ministers were required to abandon private property and to depend wholly for support on the offerings of the private members. Like the Waldenses they rejected oaths, magistracy, warfare, capital punishment, and such pursuits as seemed to involve the seeking of advantages at the expense of others or to minister to luxury, vice, or war.

(4) *Later History of the Movement.* The proceedings of 1467 intensified the wrath of Podiebrad and Rokycana against the Brethren and caused a renewal of persecution. Both of these dignitaries died in 1471 and a considerable measure of freedom was for some years the portion of the *Unitas Fratrum.* They spread rapidly over Bohemia and Moravia, absorbing most of the remnants of the Taborites and a considerable number of the Waldenses. They were commonly called, in the Catholic and Utraquist writings of the time, Waldenses or Pickards (Beghards).

Efforts were made from time to time to consummate an organic union with the Waldenses; but the latter could not be induced to declare in favor of absolute separation from Rome or to abandon occasional conformity to the ceremonies of the established church.

Large numbers of Bohemian and Moravian noblemen were sympathetic with the Brethren and protected them on their estates. Some desired membership in the body. By 1490 the rule against magistracy, including all exercise of public civil functions, and the rule prohibiting engagement in military service even in case of urgent need for warding off hostile attacks, had become exceedingly embarrassing. Violation of these rules provoked controversy. Procopius of Neuhaus, one of the constituent members of the body, advocated the modification of the rules. He received the support of Lukas of Prague, a university graduate, who from 1496 to 1528 (from 1517 he was the bishop or official head) was the leading spirit in the body. The more liberal principle prevailed and the more radical elements in some cases withdrew.

Under the leadership of Lukas the Brethren still further perfected their organization and defined their doctrine. Education was systematically promoted. The Brethren made the freest use of the printing press soon after it came into general use, and printed and circulated during the last years of the fifteenth century and the early years of the sixteenth far more literature than the Catholics and Utraquists of Bohemia and Moravia combined. They had numerous schools, that drew students from Austria and Germany as well as from their immediate constituencies.

The Brethren differed among themselves regarding infant baptism. A contemporary document states: "Some baptize children, but many do not." "To sum up," says the writer referred to, "almost all the articles of the Anabaptists have place in the synagogue of the Waldenses."[1]

About 1500 onward, King Wladislaus, at the instigation of Pope Alexander VI. and some courtiers, undertook to deprive the Brethren and the Waldenses of their privileges. In 1508 their meetings were prohibited, their writings were condemned to the flames, and they themselves were ordered to unite with the Catholic or the Utraquist Church. Considerable suffering ensued in Bohemia; but the Moravian Diet peremptorily refused to accept or to execute these measures.

---

[1] See Döllinger, "*Sektengesch.*," *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 661.

At the close of the present period the Bohemian Brethren and the Waldenses together constituted a widely distributed, intelligent, aggressive, evangelical force in the religious life of Europe. Through them many editions of the Bible and of Bible portions were being widely circulated in several of the vernaculars of the territories covered. Their public activities were considerably hampered by the unfriendliness of the ecclesiastical and the civil authorities; but they were thoroughly organized and had learned to do efficient work under adverse circumstances. It is a great mistake to suppose that the Lutheran Reformation represents the inauguration of evangelical life and thought in Germany. Luther himself recognized the evangelical character of the Brethren and made no claim to originality in his efforts at religious reform.

V. EVANGELICAL CHURCHLY REFORMERS.

The movements to be here considered have much in common with the more or less separatist parties that have just been considered and stand in the closest relationship to these as effects and causes. The Wycliffite and the Hussite movements were to a great extent due to the older evangelical influence that manifested itself chiefly in the Waldenses and related parties, and in turn exercised a considerable influence on the subsequent history of these parties. They were in many respects thoroughly evangelical, but they were hampered seriously in their reformatory efforts by their horror of schism, based in most cases upon their realistic view of the church.

1. *The Wycliffite Movement*

LITERATURE: Only a few of Wycliffe's writings were published until the present generation. The Wycliffe Society of England undertook some years ago to publish a complete critical edition of his voluminous Latin works. Several volumes have already appeared, edited by Buddenseig, Poole, Loserth, Beer, Pollard, and Dziewicky. See also Wycliffe's "Select English Works," ed. Arnold; "*Fasciculi Zizaniorum Mag. J. Wiclif*," ed. Shirley; "The Eng. Works (of W.) Hitherto Unpublished," ed. Mathew; the "*Trialogus*" and the "*De Officio Pastorali*" (of W.), ed. Lechler; Grossetête, "*Epistolæ*," ed. Luard; Foxe, "Acts and Monuments," ed. Townsend; Lechler, "*J. von Wiclif u. d. Vorgeschichte d. Reformation*" (Eng. tr. in part by Lorimer); Loserth, "Wycliffe and Huss"; Burrows, "Wycliffe's Place in History"; Trevelyan, "England in the Age of Wycliffe"; Green, "Hist. of the English People"; Buddenseig, "*J. Wiclif u. seine Zeit.*"

(1) *Antecedents*. *a*. The enslavement of England to the papacy, and the uprising of the barons, which resulted in the securing of Magna Charta (1215) under John, produced a powerful reaction against the papal absolutism that Innocent III. was attempting to establish in England. England was now recovering from the confusion that had followed the blending of nations at the Norman conquest. The spirit of national unity was developing. In 1240 the students at Oxford almost mobbed a cardinal legate.

b. In 1235, Robert Grossetête, was appointed to the bishopric of Lincoln. He was a man of profound religious convictions, great learning, and great pertinacity. He set to work to reform his diocese, deposing without scruple unworthy priests. He held it to be the duty of a bishop to preach to everybody in the diocese; and as this was impracticable, he determined to assemble the whole body of clergy at stated times, and so to instruct them that they should be able to instruct the people. He resisted with great zeal plurality of benefices, insisting that every holder of a benefice should reside in the parish. As few of the clergy could preach, he encouraged the mendicant monks to enter their parishes and preach to the people.

About 1250 he presented a memorial to Pope Innocent IV., in which he bewailed the corrupt state of the church. The cause of this corrupt state is the want of good pastors, the prevalence of bad ones, and the limitation of the power of the parish clergy. The Roman Curia is the source of this want, not only because it does not suppress corruption, but because by dispensations, provisions, collations, etc., the parishes are thrown into the hands of bad shepherds, who care for the flock not for its own sake, but for the sake of the milk and the wool, and thus the souls of men are delivered over to perdition. The bishops themselves, when they would reform their own dioceses, are hampered by the privileges of cloisters, and the right of appeal to the archbishop or pope. He exhorts the pope to abolish these abuses.

In 1258, Innocent IV. appointed one of his relations to a benefice in Robert's cathedral without consulting him, making the threat that if any one should oppose his entering upon his benefice, the opposer should appear at Rome in two months to answer for it. The bishop, now eighty years of age, defied the pope and thus became more popular than ever.

The influence of Robert upon the English thought of the next century, and especially upon Wycliffe, is clearly discernible. He was regarded by the people in general as a saint. Heavenly music was reported to have been heard at his death, and miracles to have been wrought at his tomb. The spirit of Robert was perpetuated in England till the time of Wycliffe, who quoted him as a high authority.

c. In 1299 Boniface VIII. set forth in a bull the claim that Scotland belonged to the pope. If Edward I. thought he had any right to it, he might submit to the pope the documents on which his claim was based. Edward I. put the matter before Parliament, which boldly sided with the king against the papal claims. Parliament decided that it would not allow the king, even if he desired it, to submit his claims to papal jurisdiction. Great surprise and disgust were expressed by the nobles at the audacity of the pope.

d. From 1339 England was at war with France, and the dependence of the papacy on the king of France, together with the notorious corruption of the papal court, tended still further to promote the spirit of independence.

When, in 1343, Clement VI. bestowed English benefices on two newly appointed cardinals (one of them his nephew or illegitimate son), Parliament united in an open letter to the pope, demanding a reversion of this action, maintaining that the revenues of church property in England ought to be employed entirely in maintaining worship and assisting the poor in England, and that it was contrary to the intention of those who endowed English churches that the revenues should be bestowed on non-resident foreigners. When these cardinals sent their agents to collect their revenues they were driven away in disgrace. The pope appealed to the king, who, in turn, wrote with great boldness and severity against the unrighteousness of the papal proceedings. Edward I. had thus attempted to shake off the papal oppression, but under Edward II. the pope regained the power he had lost in England.

Edward III., during his long and vigorous reign, took still more decisive measures. In 1350 the Statute against Provisors was enacted by Parliament. In this are set forth at length the great evils that England has suffered from the bestowment of provisions contrary to the design of those who endowed benefices, upon unworthy men, foreigners, etc., who performed no service for the English people; and it is ordered and established that the free elections of archbishops and bishops and of all other dignities and benefices elective in England shall be henceforth according to the original intention of the endowments. And in case reservations, collations, or prohibitions be made by the pope, in disturbance of free elections, collations, etc., the king shall have the revenues from the time when the benefice becomes void, etc. In case the papal provisors cause disturbance in trying to collect their revenues, contrary to the law, they shall be imprisoned and fined according to the king's will.

In 1352 the Statute of Præmunire was enacted, in accordance with which it was made treason for any subject of England to be arraigned before any foreign tribunal, or to take any case that falls within the jurisdiction of the king, to a foreign court. This was a blow aimed at the Roman Curia, which was usurping the rights of civil rulers by calling Englishmen, etc., to account in matters of church property, etc. In 1363 the Statute of Provisors was reaffirmed. In 1386 it was enacted that no English subject should go or send beyond the sea for the purchase of a benefice.

We see, therefore, that at the time of Wycliffe there was a widespread opposition to papal usurpations—a strong national feeling for the maintenance of English independence. This feeling was chiefly political, but it afforded a grand opportunity for an able religious leader to combat the hierarchical church on religious grounds. Such a man was Wycliffe, combining patriotism and religious zeal in a remarkable degree, one of the greatest theologians of his day, and in every way fitted to lead all classes of Englishmen.

(2) *Wycliffe's Reformatory Plan.* *a.* Wycliffe, like his predecessors, was, at first, a thorough churchman. He had strong convictions with regard to the unity of the church. As a *Realist* he looked upon schism as the greatest of evils. As the church is one, so it ought to have a single head. Yet he was led little by little to assume positions decidedly at variance with the hierarchical church. We can trace three stages in his attitude toward the papacy.

(*a*) Previous to the time of the papal schism (1378), he recognized to some extent the pope's authority as the head of the church, while rejecting boldly his usurpations. Even before the schism he declared that "they blaspheme who extol the pope above all that is called God," etc.

(*b*) The papal schism made upon Wycliffe a deep impression, and from this time forth he declared that it would be better for the church of Christ if both popes were deposed.

(*c*) During Wycliffe's controversy on the Lord's Supper, he was led, by the opposition that he met, to pronounce the pope to be Antichrist, and to see in the papacy the fulfillment of the Apocalyptic prophecies with regard to Antichrist. He now declared that only two orders of ministry were established by Christ—presbyters and deacons—and that the introduction of other orders was the result of the secularization of the church. Wycliffe's reformation, if it could not succeed throughout the whole church, must necessarily lead to schism.

b. The aspects of the papacy that most offended Wycliffe were: the extortion of funds from England, involving the impoverishing of the State and the robbing of the poor; the appointment of foreigners to benefices, rather than such as would minister to the people; and the sending forth of mendicant monks, who were at this time gaining predominance in the University of Oxford, and whose mendicant proceedings in robbing the poor filled him with indignation.

Wycliffe's first public appearance was in a contest with the monks in the university. At first he was sustained by the archbishop (1363), but after the death of the archbishop Wycliffe lost his place (1366). He appealed to the Roman Chancery. While his case was pending the pope demanded a large sum of money as quit rent in virtue of the feudal relation to the papacy in which England was placed by King John. Parliament was determined to resist, and Wycliffe wrote in defense of parliament. By this proceeding he gained the favor of the court, was made chaplain to the king, and at once entered upon a brilliant career in the university.

In 1374 Wycliffe was sent as an ambassador to Avignon, where he remained about two years. Observation of the proceedings at Avignon confirmed him in his opposition to the avarice and unscrupulousness of the papal court. The fundamental point in Wycliffe's earlier activity was the deliverance of England from the oppression and extortion of this court, and his polemics were chiefly against the monks, who were the agents and instruments of this oppression and extortion.

c. As a means of counteracting the influence of the monks, Wycliffe wrote numerous popular treatises in English, and appointed what he called "poor priests" to evangelize throughout England. In 1380 he published his translation of the Bible, which was distributed by his "poor priests." These missionaries met with great acceptance wherever they went, and large numbers were brought through them to reject the papal church, and to despise the monks.

d. Although Wycliffe was, in the first instance, moved to oppose the papacy by political considerations, there is no reason to doubt but that he was actuated at the same time by religious motives. Certain it is, that from the time of his entrance upon public life, his zeal for the purity of the church of Christ, and for the instruction of the people in the way of salvation, knew no bounds, and he would, apparently, have been ready to die for his principles.

e. In general, Wycliffe aimed to reform the church by abolishing the corrupt financial system which he believed had led the church into apostasy, and by bringing the Bible into general use as a guide for doctrine and life.

The monks he regarded as an abomination, and as the cause of much evil. They begged not for the supplying of their wants, but for the enriching of the monasteries, and used all sorts of methods for extorting money from rich and poor. Hence he aimed to abolish mendicancy. In some of his Latin polemical tracts he seeks to identify the mendicants with every class of evil-doers denounced in the New Testament. His exceeding bitterness against these "four sects" is one of the most marked features of these tracts, in which he passes by no opportunity to rebuke them.

(3) *Wycliffe's Doctrinal Position.* It is difficult to determine precisely Wycliffe's doctrinal views. We may say in general that he tended to depart more and more from Roman Catholic dogma. From his "Trialogue," one of his latest productions, we gather the following:

1. He maintained a rigorous predestinarianism, amounting almost to fatalism. He says: "It seems probable to me that God necessitates each active creature to each of its acts." He did not hesitate to express the supralapsarian view of man's fall. This view of the relation of God to man was necessitated by his extreme realism. It was inconceivable to him that there should be in the divine mind ideas that were not real. Hence God himself could do only what he actually did.

2. He rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation, maintaining that before the loosing of Satan (A. D. 1000) all the teachers of the church were in accord with his own view. When it is said, this bread is the body of Christ, it is implicitly affirmed that it is *bread* and remains *bread*, and is, at the same time bread and the body of Christ. The eucharistic controversy occupied a very important place in Wycliffe's polemics. The Roman Catholic view was, that in the same sacrament we have "*accidens sine subjecto*," *i. e.*, that while the bread and the wine maintain their form and taste, the substance is annihilated, or

transformed into the body and blood of Christ. This Wycliffe denied on realistic grounds. He supposed that the cause of men's falling into this error was that they discredited the gospel, and accepted rather papal laws and apocryphal sayings. "If there were one hundred popes, and all the friars were turned into cardinals, their opinion ought not to be acceded to in matters of faith except in so far as they base themselves on Scripture."

3. While he believed in baptismal regeneration, he thought it possible that God might save such infants as died without it, but denied that any injustice would be involved in case he should damn such.

With all of his doctrinal rigidity, Wycliffe possessed a truly evangelical spirit. He spent much of his time in preaching the gospel, as he understood it, to the people, and sent forth scores of tracts in the vernacular language for their instruction.

(4) *Proceedings against Wycliffe.* No public proceedings were instituted against Wycliffe until about 1381, when he began to impugn the doctrine of transubstantiation. The chancellor of the university at once condemned Wycliffe's view, whereupon he appealed to the king. He was prohibited from speaking again on that doctrine. He disregarded the prohibition, and expressed his views more elaborately than before. About the same time occurred a great insurrection of the peasants. This was attributed to the influence of Wycliffe's doctrines, as disseminated by the "poor priests." In 1382 the archbishop of Canterbury, at a council in London, condemned a series of propositions from Wycliffe's writings as heretical. Wycliffe was now obliged to leave Oxford, and to withdraw to his parish at Lutterworth. The rest of his life he spent in writing and preaching. Forty-four years after his death (Dec. 31, 1384) he was condemned as a heretic by the council of Constance (1418), and it was ordered that his bones be removed from consecrated ground. They were burned and the ashes were thrown into the Severn.

2. *The Hussite Movement.*

LITERATURE: "*Historia et Monumenta J. Huss atque Hieronymi* (contains also the extant writings of Matthias of Janow); Palacky, "*Documenta Mag. J. Huss Vitam . . . illustrantia*"; Hardt, "*Conc. Constantiensis*," *Lib.* IV.; Æneas Sylvius, "*Hist. Bohemiæ*"; Bonnechose, "Letters of J. Huss"; Denis, "*Huss et la Guerre des Hussites*"; Gillet, "The Life and Times of John Huss"; Neander, "Ch. H.," Vol. V.; Lechler, "*Johann von Wiclif*," *Bd.* II., *Seit.* 110–489 (this part of Lechler's great work has been unfortunately omitted from Lorimer's translation); Krummel, "*Gesch. d. Böhmischen Ref.*," also "*Utraquisten u. Taboriten*"; Palacky, "*Urkundliche Beiträge zur Gesch. Böhmens*"; Höfler, "*Urkunden zur Beleuchtung d. Ges. Böhmens*"; Loserth, "Wycliffe and Huss"; Creighton, "History of the Papacy," Vol. I., pp. 37–60, and *passim*; Friedrich, "*Die Lehre d. J. Hus*"; Berger, "*J. Huss u. König Sigismund.*"

(1) *Antecedents*. *a*. Bohemia received the gospel, not from the Roman, but from the Greek Church (ninth century). The invasion of Bohemia by the Magyars (eleventh century) led the Bohemians to seek German alliances, and gradually the forms of the Latin Church were introduced. Yet up to the time of Huss there seems always to have been considerable opposition to the Roman rule, and the Bohemians were always ready to receive those who opposed the pretensions of Rome, as the Bogomiles and the Waldenses.

Under Charles IV. (1346–1378), a most zealous Roman Catholic, Bohemia was brought fully under papal control; the bishopric of Prague was erected into an archbishopric; and the University of Prague was established with its thousands of students. Magnificent cathedrals were erected in various places. The most rigorous laws against heretics were enacted.

Yet the apparent triumph of the papal church was to be succeeded immediately by an almost complete defection. The very means by which it seemed to triumph led to a reaction. The university, established for the propagation of papal doctrine throughout Bohemia, Moravia, etc., became the chief stronghold of opposition to the papacy. The enrichment of the churches led to such a degradation of morals among the clergy as to cause a general desire for reform.

Here, as in England, the papal financial system was in full operation, and had the same effect on civil rulers and people. In 1379–1380 a grand inspection of the morals of the Bohemian clergy was undertaken. Of thirty-nine curates that were visited, sixteen were convicted of immoralities, and the manner in which they answered the charges showed great lack of moral sense.

b. The Archbishop of Prague. Pardobitz was a man of great purity of life, and was earnest in his efforts to reform the morals of clergy and monks. From 1339 onward he held synods in which measures were taken for the purification of the church. It was forbidden to the clergy to keep concubines, to frequent the taverns, gamble, bear arms, etc. It was enjoined upon them to teach the people the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Commandments. All efforts for the reformation of the clergy were favored by Charles IV.

c. A Number of Eloquent and Zealous Evangelical Preachers now Appeared. (*a*) *Conrad of Waldhausen*, an Austrian, an Augustinian monk, having previously gained a high reputation for eloquence at Vienna, was called to Prague through the influence of Charles IV. (1360 or 1362). He was full of zeal, feeling that the salvation of his own soul and that of the people depended upon his preaching of repentance to the utmost of his ability. He rebuked in the most thoroughgoing way the sins of high and low, laymen and clergy. The more severe his preaching, the more the people flocked to hear him. Women laid aside their costly dresses; usurers made haste to restore their ill-gotten gains; libertines made vows of chastity. His denunciation of monks and clergy aroused their animosity. They brought various accusations against him, and a day for trial was appointed; but the monks prudently failed to appear. Conrad preached in German and Latin; hence a large part of the population of Prague were affected only indirectly by his preaching.

(*b*) But before his death (1369) a native Bohemian of greater genius than Conrad had appeared, *Militsch of Kremsier*. Militsch already held a high ecclesiastical position when Conrad appeared in Bohemia, and was also private secretary to Charles IV. As archdeacon, in his visitation journeys, he had an opportunity to observe the extreme corruption of the church. In 1363 he renounced his dignities and income, adopted an ascetical mode of life, and resolved in humility and poverty to follow Christ in preaching the gospel.

He soon began to preach in Bohemian—a new thing. At first he had few hearers, but in a short time his ministry was thronged, so that he preached every day two or three hours at a time, and on Sundays and fast days from two to five times. He soon had great influence with all classes. When he was not preaching, most of his time was taken up in ministering consolation and direction in private to the multitudes that visited him. More than two hundred prostitutes were induced to abandon their life of shame. An ill-famed part of the town—the "Little Venice"—was destroyed by his direction, and in its place was built a house of refuge for these reformed women —"Little Jerusalem."

By a study of the apocalyptic Scriptures, Militsch became convinced that Antichrist had come in the corruption of the church. In 1367 he went to Rome to inform the pope of the new light that he had received, and to urge him to take in hand the reformation of the church. The pope was absent, and he published his views on the door of St. Peter's. For this he was arrested and imprisoned until the pope returned, when he was liberated. He returned to Prague much discouraged, but soon went to work with renewed zeal, and in addition to his former activities, undertook the work of training evangelists. In 1372 the monks brought accusation against him, but in 1374 he journeyed to Avignon and vindicated his orthodoxy. While there he fell sick and died.

(*c*) *Matthias of Janow*, son of a Bohemian knight, had spent six years in the University of Paris as a student of philosophy and theology. He had also traveled much in Germany and Italy, and was one of the most cultivated men of the time. He represents himself as having been, during his early student life at Prague, a slave to his passions. But, probably under the influence of Militsch, there "entered into his breast a certain fire, subtle, new, strong, and unusual, but exceedingly sweet." He now came to feel himself called to preach the pure gospel, and by his writings to diffuse the truth. In 1381 he became a prebendary at Prague, where he spent much time in preaching and in pastoral work. But Matthias' chief merit is as a writer. As a theological writer he stands second only to Huss among Bohemian reformers, while in some matters he seems to have gone beyond Huss himself. His work, "Concerning the Rules of the Old and New Testament," is one of the most remarkable of the reformatory productions of the Middle Ages. It was read and admired by professors and students and learned men in general, but being written in Latin it could have only an indirect influence upon the people. Matthias, with his clear reformatory views, seems "to have lacked only exterior action for becoming the chief of the Bohemian revolution." The papal schism had already been consummated when he entered upon active life. Two or three rival popes were demanding the allegiance of the people and anathematizing one another. He was therefore enabled more definitely than Militsch to center his notions of Antichrist upon the papacy.

A leading thought with Matthias, therefore, is, that Antichrist is in the world. Antichrist and his doings are alluded to and condemned on almost every page. He inquires as to the cause of the papal schism. It arose, "not because they loved Jesus Christ and his church, but because they loved themselves and this world." The body of Antichrist is thus rent asunder, but not the body of Christ. Matthias believed in the church as an organic unity, with its one head and its gradation of officers. His great complaint was of the selfishness, tyranny, and secularization of pope and bishops. He regarded the guidance of the church by means of the word of God taught by the parish clergy as a most important thing, and he bewailed the viciousness of the great body of the clergy and their utter neglect of duty.

The multiplication of ecclesiastical laws seemed to him to be at the bottom of much of the corruption of clergy and people. Human ordinances, with superiors whose business it was to enforce them, had come to make more impression on men's minds than divine ordinances, whose nature is spiritual. Thus men lose sight of Christ crucified, so that they are ashamed even to mention his name.

Matthias combated the notion that the clergy are the church, and that ordinary Christians should be admitted to the Lord's Supper as seldom as possible. He regarded the Supper as a most important means of grace, which ought to be provided frequently for the people. He strongly emphasized the universal priesthood of believers. This was one of the burning ideas in the Bohemian revolution, and involved the right of laymen to communion under both kinds.

Matthias' exposition of the corruption of monks and clergy drew upon him the ill-will of these classes. At a synod held in Prague (1389) he was called to account, especially with regard to his expressions in favor of the full right of laymen to the Lord's Supper; yet he continued to strive for the reformation of the church till his death (1394).

d. What Matthias did toward awakening the reformatory spirit among the learned, *Thomas of Stitny* did among the masses. The requirement made of each bachelor of arts in the university, that he should devote at least two years to teaching, had diffused intelligence throughout a large part of the community. Stitny was educated in the University of Prague, a thorough Bohemian, and a charming writer in the Bohemian language. His writings combine religious earnestness with Bohemian patriotism and recognition of the rights of the lower classes. The tendency of his writings was strongly revolutionary, and they did more than any other agency, perhaps, to prepare the great mass of the Bohemian people for the uprising against Roman and German oppression.

The Bohemians belonged to the Slavic race, and could never be induced to merge themselves in the German. For generations they had been dependent upon Germany. Most of the great landed proprietors and nobles were German, as were also the wealthy tradesmen and officials of the cities. Bohemians were ineligible to high civil offices. The great body of serfs was Bohemian, as were many of the laborers and artisans in the cities.

The Bohemian people, through hatred of their oppressors, were ready for revolution. They required only strong leaders. The landed proprietors and the rich mercantile class opposed revolution with all their might. Stitny had awakened the mass of the Bohemian population.

The great university was attended by thousands of

Germans, and here, also, the Germans were attempting to dominate. The Bohemians, under the leadership of Huss, resisted their encroachments, and the revolution may be said to have begun with the departure from Prague of the German students (1409).

e. The arbitrary manner in which Waclav IV., the successor of Charles IV., a weak and vicious ruler, had proceeded with the clergy (arresting and treating with indignity the archbishop, and ordering a monastery to be pillaged), and the support he had lent to the Bohemians in the university against the Germans, tended to decrease the respect of the Bohemians for the Roman Catholic Church, and to prepare the peasants to rise up against their oppressors.

f. The writings of Wycliffe had been introduced into the University of Prague before the close of the fourteenth century. After the marriage of Anne, daughter of Charles IV., to Richard II. of England (1382), considerable intercourse had been established between the universities of Oxford and Prague; and by the time of Huss' public appearance Wycliffe's writings were held in high esteem, and were subjects of frequent discussion. The immediate influence of these writings on Huss was very great.

(2) *Reformatory Work of John Huss*. John Huss, born 1367, was educated at the University of Prague, where he became bachelor in 1393, master in 1396, lecturer in 1398, dean of the philosophical faculty in 1401, and rector of the university in 1403. In 1402 he was appointed preacher in the "Bethlehem" chapel, which had been established some years earlier by two wealthy citizens of Prague, for the purpose of promoting evangelical preaching in the Bohemian language—a result of the labors of Militsch.

Up to 1402 Huss had taken more interest in philosophy and scholastic theology than in evangelical work. He had studied the philosophical writings of Wycliffe, and had used them in his lectures. He had adopted the realism of Wycliffe, and had already come into controversy with the nominalistic Germans.

His duty as preacher to the people, and his sense of the responsibility of his position, led him to study the Scriptures as he had never done before. He came to feel that the great evils in the church had resulted largely from neglect of biblical study. About the same time he became acquainted with Wycliffe's theological works through Jerome of Prague, who had studied at Oxford, and who became even more zealous than Huss for reform.

Huss soon won great reputation as a moral preacher. In 1405 he began to denounce the corruption of the clergy in the synods, in which he was supported by King Waclav. By preaching against the clergy he made many enemies, and his Bohemian patriotism and his zeal in defending Wycliffe and disseminating his views, made him odious to the Germans in the university.

In the church at Wilsnack miracles were supposed to be wrought by the pretended blood of Christ there exhibited. In 1405 Huss was appointed on a commission to visit the place and investigate the matter. The fraud was exposed, and pilgrimages to Wilsnack forbidden.

The strife between the Bohemian nation and the German, in the university, induced partly by the strong national aversion of Bohemians to Germans, partly by differences of philosophical views, led in 1409 to the diminution of the privileges of the Germans, and their withdrawal from Bohemia.

Huss was now completely dominant in the university. The archbishop had become jealous of Huss' influence, especially as he felt himself rebuked by some of the reformer's denunciations of the clergy. In 1410 he procured from Pope Alexander V. a bull forbidding preaching in private chapels and requiring the burning of Wycliffe's works. Huss, supported by king and queen, nobility and university, continued to preach in the "Bethlehem" chapel and to write in defense of Wycliffe; and Archbishop Sbynko revoked his accusation of heresy.

In 1412 the pope issued a crusading bull against Waclav, with the usual promise of indulgences. Huss and Jerome now protested with greater zeal than before against indulgences and their abuses. This led to the condemnation of Wycliffe's works at Rome and to the excommunication of Huss (1413).

Huss now wrote his great work on the church, and retired from Prague. He was summoned to appear before the council of Constance (1414), and went under the safe-conduct of the Emperor Sigismund. He felt secure from the fact that he was not charged with heresy, and that the object of the council was reformation. But it was made known at Constance about the time of his arrival, that James of Misa, a priest of Prague, had begun giving the communion to the laity under both kinds, and this was considered the result of Huss' teaching. Moreover, Huss was regarded as the chief cause of the expulsion of the Germans from the university. On November 28, 1414, Huss was thrown into prison on the charge of heresy. Despite the protest of the Prague University and the Bohemian nobles, the safe-conduct of the emperor was violated, and without the show of a fair trial Huss was burned, July, 1415.

(3) *Reasons for the Condemnation of Huss.* *a.* The condemnation of Huss was due, probably, not to any doctrinal aberration on his part, but to the fact that he was the leader of a party that threatened the existence of the hierarchical church. His unsparing denunciations of the clergy had brought the latter into disrepute. The visible striving of the Bohemian nation for political freedom from the Germans was seen to tend toward freedom from ecclesiastical authority. Moreover, Huss was a zealous defender of Wycliffe, and the results of Wycliffe's views, as seen in Lollardism, were well known. It required no extraordinary amount of penetration to see that similar results would follow the teachings of Huss and Jerome.

b. Again, Huss appeared to the council to be obstinate and self-willed, and to set up his own views of truth in opposition to those of the universal church.

c. Again, the very fact that the Council of Constance was a reformatory council, led by such spirits as John Gerson, Peter d'Ailly, etc., helps us to account for the condemnation of the reformer Huss. The members of the council felt that they were taking a bold step in assembling without papal summons, and to deal with popes. They must guard against any appearance of sympathy with revolutionary spirits, else the council would fail to secure the general recognition necessary to the accomplishment of its ends. It was clear that Huss was a revolutionary spirit. If allowed to return to Bohemia, he would, without fail, carry on a revolution which would result in the alienation of Bohemia from the church.

d. Again, the council was called by Sigismund, who was hated by Bohemians, and who had no sympathy with them. The preponderance of power in the council was German; Huss was looked upon as the great champion of Bohemian liberty, and it was remembered that he had been chiefly instrumental in driving away the Germans from Prague. The members of the council were, therefore, extremely prejudiced against him.

(4) *Doctrinal Position of Huss. a. On the Church*. The holy Catholic Church is, according to Huss, the whole number of all the predestinated—present, past, and future. Hence, he distinguished between being *in* the church and being *of* the church. Of this universal church Christ alone is the head. Neither pope nor cardinals are necessary to the regimen of the church.

b. The Eucharist. Huss was accused of holding, with Wycliffe, that the bread and wine remain bread and wine after consecration. This he absolutely denied.

Apart from his view with regard to the church, and his denial of the authority of popes and clergy, when corrupt, nothing like heresy could be established against Huss. He was a man of less originality and power than Wycliffe. In fact, most of his writings are made up almost wholly of excerpts from Wycliffe.[1]

(5) *The Hussite Wars*. The contempt which the council of Constance showed for Bohemia, the decree pronouncing heretics those who should insist on communion under both kinds, the execution of Huss and afterward of Jerome of Prague, exasperated the Bohemians, already restless and desirous of revolution.

James of Misa defended communion under both kinds against the council; Huss was honored as a martyr; the Bohemian and Moravian nobles assembled and wrote a condemnatory letter to the council, and formed a league for six years for the protection of purity of doctrine; the university pronounced for communion under both kinds, and the Bohemian people were now ready to defend this view with their lives.

---

[1] See Loserth, "Wiclif and Hus," p. 181, *seq.*

The council issued instructions for the putting down of the schism, and the pope sent legates to carry out the plan of the council. Under Nicolas of Hussinecz, and John Ziska, noblemen, thousands of Bohemians gathered for self-defense. This enthusiastic host ascended Mount Tabor, and there celebrated the Lord's Supper under both kinds. The city of Tabor was founded, and the Taborites became fanatical in their zeal for reform. Waclav was utterly unable to control the different parties or to keep order.

In 1419 Ziska moved upon Prague, and in a most sanguinary manner took vengeance upon the council. When Waclav died (1419) the people were so determinedly opposed to Sigismund that complete anarchy prevailed.

There now appeared two parties of Hussites: the Hussites of Prague, who did not go beyond Huss and James of Misa, who simply demanded the cup (Calixtines or Utraquists, from *calix*, a "cup," and *sub utraque specie*, "under both kinds"), who did not desire to make a complete schism with the hierarchical church, who held in general to the doctrine of the Romish Church, but desired to see the church reformed in morals; and the Taborites, who assumed a position of the most uncompromising hostility to the papal church, and under the influence of the Waldenses and other older sects, made the Scriptures their absolute authority and guide.

3. *Brethren of the Common Life.*

LITERATURE: Ullmann, "Reformers Before the Reformation"; Preger, "*Beiträge zur Gesch. d. rel. Bewegung in d. Niederlanden in d. zweiten Halfte d. XIV. Jahrh.*"; Kettlewell, "Thomas a Kempis and the Brethren of the Common Life"; art. by Schultze on "*Brüder d. gemeinsamen Lebens*" in Herzog-Hauck, third ed., *Bd.* III., *Seit.* 472–507 (this able account of the Brethren is preceded by a full bibliography).

The Brethren of the Common Life originated in the Netherlands as a result of the evangelical mysticism of Joh. Ruysbroek. Its founders were Gerhard Groot and Florentius. It combined the most evangelical type of mysticism with semi-monastic life and enthusiastic devotion to evangelistic work, to education, and to literary production. It arose about the middle of the fourteenth century, during the "Babylonish exile" of the papacy. With the permission of his bishop and with the counsel of the aged Ruysbroek, Groot began preaching repentance and conversion to multitudes of eager listeners at Deventer, Zwolle, Leyden, Delft, Gouda, and Amsterdam (*c.* 1379). A number of well-educated, evangelical men were soon at his side, ready to carry forward the work thus inaugurated. Florentius was among his earliest converts and succeeded him in the leadership of the movement (1384).

Religious houses were soon organized in these and a number of other places in the Netherlands and in many of the chief centers of Northern Germany. Similar houses for sisters were speedily founded in a number of places, and the influence of the brotherhood became widespread and beneficent. It was at its height about the close of the period, and many of the Brethren welcomed the Protestant revolution and joined hands with the Reformers.

There was no intention on the part of Groot and his coadjutors to break with the Roman Catholic Church. Groot hesitated to introduce the communal principle, believing that the mendicant orders would never tolerate them, but he was persuaded by Florentius to make the experiment and to leave the results to God.

The peculiarity of their organization consisted in their dispensing with vows, and voluntarily associating on the basis of devout living combined with labor for support. Mendicancy was forbidden. The Brethren copied books and did various other kinds of remunerative work for their support, and engaged as far as practicable in teaching and preaching.

They have been compared by Acquoy to the modern Methodists and by Ritschl to the Pietists. While they preached justification by faith, they were careful to insist on the necessity of upright and devout living. They emphasized the freedom of the will, like most of the evangelicals of the Middle Ages and like the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century. No doubt their piety was of a somewhat ascetical type and fell somewhat short in its freedom and joyfulness of the best types of modern evangelical life.

4. "*Reformers Before the Reformation.*"

LITERATURE: Ullmann, "Reformers Before the Reformation"; Clemen, "*Joh. Pupper von Goch*"; Friedrich, "*Joh. Wessel, ein Bild aus d. Kirchengesch. d. XV. Jahrh.*"; Gieseler, "Eccl. Hist.," Vol. III., p. 453, *seq.*; Lea, "Hist. of the Inquisition," Vol. III., p. 209, *seq.* (on Savonarola); Villari, "Life of Savonarola"; Creighton, "Hist. of the Papacy," Vol. III., *passim.*

The designation "Reformers before the Reformation" has been somewhat exclusively applied, without any sufficient reason, to a number of able reforming spirits of the fifteenth century, including John Pupper of Goch, John of Wesel, John of Wessel, and Savonarola.

(1) *Savonarola* (d. 1498) was a Dominican monk of the extreme ascetical type, who ~~attempted in Florence~~ by bold (rash) denunciations of political and ecclesiastical corruption, to bring about a reformation of abuses. The stress of his enthusiastic efforts for reform seems to have destroyed his mental equipoise, and he assumed the rôle of a prophet with the usual fanatical manifestations. Savonarola was not an evangelical Christian in the modern sense of the term, and his success would not have meant the restoration of Christianity to its primitive simplicity and purity. He fell a victim to civil and papal intolerance.

(2) *John Pupper of Goch* (d. 1475), under the influence of the Brethren of the Common Life, of the Renaissance, of the revived study of the works of Augustine, and of evangelical mysticism, emphasized the authority of the Scriptures rightly interpreted, over against traditionalism and ecclesiastical authority. He laid great stress on love to God and love to man as embodying the essence of religion. He was an extreme nominalist in philosophy and repudiated the speculations of scholasticism as vain and useless. He denied that reason could penetrate the realms of the supernatural. Only the "light of faith and of grace" can apprehend the "supremely true" and the "supremely good." He preached justification by faith in the Augustinian sense, and repudiated Pelagianism and Semi-pelagianism as well as the whole mediæval system of justification by works. He regarded saving faith as a transforming process wherein the subject is not simply declared righteous but made righteous.

He probably received his early training in a school of the Brethren of the Common Life. He studied at Cologne and then in the University of Paris. From 1459 onward he presided over an Augustinian monastery for women that he had founded.

(3) *John of Wesel* (d. 1482) was professor in the University of Erfurt during the middle years of the century (*c.* 1445–1456). He had been profoundly influenced by the new learning and by the revived study of Augustine. As preacher at Worms he denounced indulgences and the entire sacerdotal system of the hierarchical church on which indulgences rested. "Whom God wishes to save he would save by giving him grace, if all the priests should wish to damn and excommunicate him." He repudiated the authority of the church to interpret the Scriptures for believers. The personal authority of the church extends no farther than its agreement with the gospel. The law of Christ he made supreme. He insisted that the elect are saved by grace alone. He rejected the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, holding that the substance of the bread and the wine remain. He was arraigned before the church authorities at Mainz and after defending his positions as well as he could he felt obliged to recant (1479). He died in prison three years later.

(4) *John of Wessel* (d. 1489), educated in a school of the Brethren of the Common Life, in the University of Cologne, and in the University of Paris, was one of the most eminent scholars and thinkers of his age. He was called by his contemporaries the "light of the world." He taught in the universities of Cologne, Louvain, Paris, and Heidelberg, and ended his wonderful career in peace. Luther said: "If he had been read by me beforehand, it might well have seemed to my enemies that I had drawn everything from Wessel, so completely does the spirit of us two conspire into one." In him also we see a convergence of the influence of the Renaissance, of the revived study of Augustine, and of evangelical mysticism. Like John of Wesel he clearly proclaimed the doctrine of justification by faith. "He who thinks to be justified through his own works does not know what it is to be just." Like John of Wesel, and on the same grounds,

he attacked indulgences. Works of supererogation on which they were in part based he declares to be impossible for sinful man.

The possibility of carrying on with so little interruption the evangelical work of the Brethren of the Common Life and of the great reforming teachers whose activity has been considered, was due in a large measure to the widespread popular desire for evangelical teaching and in part to the tolerant spirit of the Renaissance.

If we consider the civilizing forces that were at work at the close of the present period, as set forth very briefly and imperfectly in Chapter I., the appalling corruption of the hierarchical church, as set forth in Chapter II., the evangelical forces that were leavening the population of Europe, which have been only partially described in the present chapter, and the widespread discontent of the masses with the social and economic conditions that prevailed, the Protestant Revolution of the sixteenth century, with its true and its false elements, can be easily understood.

END OF VOLUME I

End.

GENERAL INDEX

Abelard: sketch of, 477, *seq.;* mentioned, 560, 563.
Acolytes, referred to, 294.
Acts: why abruptly terminated, 113; 19: 32, 39, 40, 41, 125; 9: 31, 125; 16: 5, 126; 2: 46, 137; 20: 7, 11, 137.
"Acts of Pilate," mentioned, 170.
Adoptionism, early: account of, 198; of Archelaus, 200; of Hermas, 200.
Adoptionist controversy, discussed, 355, *seq.*
Aelia Capitolina, mentioned, 154.
Aërian controversy, outlined, 373, *seq.*
Aërius, mentioned, 373, *seq.*
Agapai (ἀγάπαι) 137, *seq.*, 140.
Ahriman, 36, 37.
Albanenses, the, sketch of, 546, *seq.*
Albertus Magnus, sketch of, 482, *seq.*
Albigenses, the, account of, 548, *seq.*
Albinus, 117.
Alcuin, 358.
Alexander of Hales, sketch of, 481, *seq.*
Alexander Severus, Emperor, 162, *seq.*
Alexander the Great: a pupil of Aristotle, 24; the influence of his conquests, 27; treats the Jews kindly, 39.
Alexander III., Pope, 511, *seq.*
Alexander V., Pope, 528.
Alexander VI., Pope, 537, *seq.*
Alexandria: a center of culture and of cults, 27, *seq.;* the place of the Jews in, 39, *seq.*
Alexandrian school: its relation to Philo, 62; under Alexander Severus, 162; rise of, 271; teaching and influence of, 272; Christology of, 337.
Allegorical method of interpretation: adopted by Philo, 59, *seq.;* use of, among earlier Greeks, Egyptians, and Christians, 60; use of, in "Ep. of Barnabas," 221; polemical writers feel its weakness, 248; rejected by Irenæus, 249; reduced to a system by the Alexandrian school, 272; rise and progress of, 286; Origen's use of, 286; place of, at beginning of fourth century, 293.
Alogoi, the, referred to, 158, 198.
Alzog, as a church historian, 16.
Amalric, sketch of, 555.
Amalricians, the, sketch of, 555, *seq.*
Ambrosius, the friend of Origen, 281.
Ameretat, mentioned, 37.
American church historians, 16.
Anabaptist, use of the term in Cyprian's time, 270.
Anacletus, Roman bishop, 215.
Anastasius of Rome, his attitude toward Origen, 334.
Anatolius, referred to, 399.
Anchoretism, referred to, 317.
Andrew, mentioned, 110.
Angels: in Zoroastrianism, 37; in Pharisaism, 49; in Philo, 61; of the Seven Churches, 134.
Annates, referred to, 519.
Anselm, sketch of, 476, *seq.*
Antony, the hermit, 317, *seq.*
Anthropology, discussed, 358, *seq.*
Antichrist, referred to, 123.
Antioch: its rise, 27; evangelized, 89, 90; an evangelizing center, 90.
Antiochian school: forerunners of, 200; its history and teachings, 297, 326; Christology of, 336, *seq.*
Antiochus Epiphanes, mentioned, 45.
Antiochus III., mentioned, 45.
Antoninus Pius, mentioned, 154.
Antrustions, defined, 444.
Apocalypse. (See Revelation.)
Apocrypha, mentioned, 41, 42.
Apollinaris, views of, 336.
Apollonius of Rome, martyrdom of, 160.
Apollonius of Tyana, 32, 161.
Apologists, early Christian, 237, *seq.*
Apollos, referred to, 99, *seq.*, 111.
Apostle, two senses of the word, 132.
Apostolic influence ceases, 123, 124.
Apostolic succession, 158.
Apotheosis of the emperors, its twofold influence on the people, 13.
Arabic philosophy, 479, *seq.*
Archangels in Zoroastrianism, 36.
Archelaus, acts of, 200.
Arian controversy, 324, *seq.*
Arianism: its teaching, 326, *seq.;* fortunes of, 330, *seq.;* its relation to Origen's teachings, 332; its view of sin, 360.
Arius, sketch of, 326; at the Nicene Council, 329, *seq.;* his Christology, 335.
"Aristides, Apology of": referred to, 155; its recovery, history, and contents, 240, *seq.*
Aristotle: his place in Greek philosophy, 24; his influence on pre-Christian thought, 24; his influence on mediæval theology, 24; his views, 24, *seq.;* his approximation to Christian doctrine, 25; his influence on Philo, 60; his influence on Scotus

Erigena, 475, *seq.;* his influence on Arabic philosophy, 479; his influence on scholasticism, 481, 483; protests of the Mystics against, 485.

Arminian Christianity, influenced by Marcion, 193.

Arnold, Gottfried, referred to, 14.

Arnold of Brescia, 563, *seq.*

Arnoldists, 565.

Arshtat, 37.

Artaxerxes Longimanus, aids the Jews, 35.

Artisans, their place in the spread of Christianity, 142.

Arundel, mentioned, 592.

Asceticism: among the Essenes, 51, *seq.;* of the Ebionites, 175; in Gnosticism, 184, 186; of Tatian, 186; of the Manichæans, 196, *seq.;* of the Montanists, 203, 205; of Origen, 280; at the close of the fourth century, 371, *seq.;* protests against, 374, 377.

Asha Vahishta, mentioned, 36.

Asia Minor, the Jews in, 56.

Ashi, mentioned, 37.

Atar, mentioned, 37.

Aterbius, attitude of toward Origen's opinions, 333.

Athanasius: views of, 328; becomes leader of opposition to Arius, 330; his attitude toward Origen's teachings, 332, *seq.*

Athanasius, patriarch of Antioch, 351.

Athanasians, the: views of, 327, 328, 335; triumph of, 331.

Athenagoras, "Apology" of, 237, 246.

Athens, Paul's work in, 98.

Augurs, among the Romans, 30.

Augustine: on the Donatists, 322; characterized, 361, *seq.;* doctrinal views of, 365, *seq.;* his views not immediately accepted, 369, *seq.*

Augustine, the monk: mentioned, 411; sketch of, 415, *seq.;* influence of his writings at the dawn of the Reformation, 619, 620.

Augustinian order of monks, 455.

Augustinianism, its antecedents, 359, *seq.*

Augustus, the Emperor: his vain struggle against national unbelief, 31: becomes Pontifex Maximus, 31.

Aurelian, the Emperor, referred to, 198.

Authorship of early writings. (See Pseudepigrapha.)

Avignon, papal residence at, 523, *seq.*

Azarias, prayer of, 41.

Babylonian captivity of the Jews, its effects, 35.

Babylonian dualism, relation of to Gnosticism, 182.

Babylonian sects at Alexandria, 28.

Babylonish captivity of the church, 523.

Baptism: among the Essenes, 51, 54; of Jewish proselytes, 58, 59; of John, 70; of Jesus, 70; the Pentecostal, 82; at day of Pentecost, 83; first, of Gentile into fellowship, 89; of those who had known of John's baptism only, 101; its meaning and form in New Testament, 136; Harnack, Hauck, and Loofs on, 136; Zenos on, 137; in "Clementines," 178, 179; among the Ebionites, 179, 180; in the "*Pistis Sophia*," 189; Novatian's view of, 207; Donatist view of, 210; in "Hermas," 230; in "Teaching of the Twelve," 236; in Justin Martyr, 245; Tertullian's view of, 262, 263; Origen's view of, 285; in "Ecclesiastical Constitutions," 290; at the beginning of the fourth century, 296, 297; views of its validity when performed by heretics, 270; Pelagian view of, 364; Augustine's view of, 366; Jovinian's view of, 375; Paulician views of, 382, 383; British disputes about, 410, 411; Eastern and Western doctrine of, 425, 426; Bonaventura's view of, 482; Petrobrusian views of, 561, 562; Arnold's views of, 564; Eudo's views of, 567, 568; Rhenish dissenters' views of, 568; views of Poor Men of Lyons and of Lombardy regarding, 574; Waldensian views of, 580; Chelcicky's views of, 588; views of Bohemian Brethren regarding, 599; Wycliffe's view of, 607.

Barcochab, rebellion of, 154, 175.

Barnabas: welcomes Paul, 90; his mission work with Paul, 91, *seq.;* his misunderstanding with Paul, 96; tradition regarding, 110.

"Barnabas, Epistle of," its authorship, date, contents, etc., 219, *seq.*

Bartholomew, the apostle, mentioned, 110.

Baruch, referred to, 42.

Basil of Cæsarea, mentioned, 329, 333.

Basilides, his system of Gnosticism expounded, 186, *seq.*

Baur, as a church historian, 15.

Becket, Thomas a, 512, 513.

Beghards, the, sketch of, 556.

Beguines, the, sketch of, 556.

Bel and the Dragon, mentioned, 41.

Benedict XIII., 526.

Benedictine order of monks, 455.

Bernard of Clairvaux: mentioned, 455, 460; preaches against heretics, 550; preaches and writes against Arnold of Brescia, 563.

Berœa, Paul's work at, 98.

Beryllus, referred to, 201.

Beyschlag, his estimate of the character and influence of Jesus, 79.

Bible. (See Scriptures.)

Biblical criticism, Origen the father of, 282.

Bigg, his view of Philo, 61.

Bishop: place of, in "1 Clement," 124; place of, in New Testament,

133, 134; identical with presbyter, 134; meaning in time of Ignatius, 227; place of, in "Hermas," 331; position at beginning of fourth century, 293, 295; Cyprian the first to distinguish from presbyter, 266.
Black Stone of Edessa, 162.
Boëthius, translator of works of Aristotle, 475.
Bogomiles, history and doctrines of, 543, *seq.*
Bohemia, Christianity in, 608.
Bohemian Brethren, sketch of, 593, *seq.*
Bologna: became center for the study of Roman law, 448; University of, 470.
Bonaventura: sketch of, 482; mentioned, 554.
Boniface, Archbishop of Maintz, 419, *seq.*
Boniface VIII., 521, *seq.*
Boniface IX., 554.
Bossuet, as a church historian, 14.
Brethren: of the Free Spirit, 557; Common Life, 617, *seq.*
Breyer, on Arnold of Brescia, 564.
Brigitta of Sweden, prophetess, 524.
Britain, early Christianity in, 409, *seq.*
British Empire, compared with the Roman, as regards evangelization, 32.
British church historians, 16.
Brotherhood, Pythagorean, 22.
Bruce, A. B., on the character and influence of Jesus, 78.
Brute, Walter, views of, 591.
Buddhism: relation to Essenism, 53; relation to Gnosticism, 182; influence of, on Mani, 195.
Bunsen, on the "Ignatian Epistles."

Cabbala, referred to, 181.
Cæcilian, of Carthage, 209, 320, 321.
Cæsarea: Paul at, 104; Origen's home, 287.
Caligula, Emperor, enrages Jews of Palestine, 116.
Callistus, bishop of Rome, 201, 255, *seq.*
Calixtus III., Pope, 535.
Canon Law: discovered, 430; and forged decretals, 447, *seq.*
Canon: Old Testament, 39; New Testament, 212; Irenæus on, 250; history of New Testament, 301, *seq.*
Captivity, Babylonian, effects of, 35.
Caracalla, Emperor, 161.
Cardinal: origin of the term, 449, *seq.*; functions of, 450.
Carlovingian kingdom, and the papacy, 406, *seq.*
Carmelite order of monks, 455.
Carthage: early church life in, 264; council of, in relation to Donatism, 322, *seq.*
Cassiodorus, mentioned, 13.
Catacombs, use of, for Christian worship, 167, 295, *seq.*
Catechizing, early use of, 297.
Cathari: sketch of, 545, *seq.*; relation of, to Peter de Bruys and Henry of Lausanne, 559.
Catharine of Siena, prophetess, 524.
Cathedra Petri, Church of Rome first regarded as, 267.
Catholic (Roman) doctrine, anticipated by the Montanists, 203.
Celedonius, a Gallic bishop, 398.
Celibacy of clergy: its rise, 298; Gregory the Great insists on, 405. (See also Asceticism.)
Celsus, the philosopher, writes against Christianity, 159; answered by Origen, 282.
Cerdo, Gnostic teacher, 228.
Cerinthus, speculative Ebionite, 122, 175, *seq.*
Chalcedon, council of, 347, *seq.*
Chalcedonian symbol, 348.
Charity among early Christians: discussed, 128, 129, 143; by whom distributed, 134, 135; perverted, 292; how distributed in days of Cyprian, 269, 270.
Charlemagne; sketch of, 407, *seq.*; and Holy Roman Empire, 439, 440; opposes image worship, 391, 392; influence of, in spread of learning, 469; relation of, to the papacy, 495, 496.
Charles Martel, 418, 420, 434.
Charles the Bald, 441.
Charles the Fat, 441.
Chelcicky, Peter: work and views of, 586, *seq.*; influence of, on the Bohemian Brethren, 593, *seq.*
Children's Crusade, 461.
Chiliasm: of Cerinthus, 176; in the Middle Ages, 551, *seq.* (See also Eschatology.)
Christianity: influenced by Judaism, 4; how approximated to heathenism, 4, 5; its present position and ultimate triumph, 17–19: the Roman Empire helps to spread it, 32, 33; not proscribed as such by Nero, 115; how affected by the destruction of Jerusalem, 118, 119; a *religio illicita*, 148; aspires to universality and hence suspected by Roman government, 149; hated by influential classes, 149; hated by idol-makers, 150; distasteful to philosophers, 150; progress of, in Asia Minor in Trajan's time, 151, 152; aggressive under M. Aurelius, 156; advertised by persecution of M. Aurelius, 158, 159; became corrupt, 159, 160; tolerated by Caracalla and Heliogabalus, 161; its progress facilitated by removal of artificial social distinctions, 161; attitude of Alexander Severus toward, 162; persecuted by Maximinus, 163; favored by Philip the Arabian, 163; persecuted by Decius, 164–166; suffers from worldliness, 165; persecuted by Valerian, 166, 167; fa-

vored by Gallienus, 167; persecuted by Diocletian, 168–170; possesses some distinguished converts, 168; persecuted by Maximinus in the East, 170; partial toleration of, 170; complete toleration of, 171; triumph of, in Roman Empire, 172; parties in, 173, 174; sects of, 174, *seq.;* philosophical statement of, occasioned by Gnosticism, 193; influence of mysteries on, 194; ritual from Gnostic influences, 194; influenced by paganism, 194; influenced by Manichæism, 197; conditions for scientific statement of, 213; piety of, in first to third centuries, 214; influenced by Montanism, 260; condition of, at beginning of fourth century, 291, *seq.*, 298, 299; Constantine's attitude toward, 305, *seq.;* opposed by Julian, 309, 310; supported by law under Theodosius, 310, 311; was influenced by union with the State, 311, *seq.;* its influence on Roman law, 312; becomes a persecutor, 315; of East and West compared, 325; at beginning of eighth century, 406; at close of eighth century, 424, *seq.*
Christian science, mediæval parallel to, 557.
Christian thought: influenced by Pythagoras, 22; influenced by Plato, 23, 24; influenced by Aristotle, 25; influenced by Stoicism, 26; influenced by Gnosticism, 193, 194; amalgamation of, with pagan thought, 194; how influenced by Origen, 286, 287.
Christians: community of goods among, 83, 84; of Jerusalem withdrew to Pella, 118; forced to meet in secret, 143; meetings of, in Trajan's time, 151; public calamities arouse the people against, 154, 156, 166; torture used against, 158; charged with arson, 168; their confiscated property restored, 171; gradually acquire culture, 212, 213; moral condition of in time of Hermas, 229–231; culture spreads among, 238; serious charges made against, 149, 157, 238; at beginning of fourth century, 297, 298.
Christmas, when it was first celebrated, 299.
Christology: of Paul of Samosata, 198; of Sabellius, 201; of Justin, 244; of Irenæus, 250, 251; of Tertullian, 260, 261; type of, in Carthage, 264; of Clement of Alexandria, 277, 278; of Origen, 284; of Dionysius of Alexandria, 288, 289; becomes center of vigorous discussion, 324, *seq.*, 335, *seq.;* of Leo, 344, 345; a satisfactory formula arrived at, 354, 355; of the Adoptionists, 355, *seq.* (See also Logos.)
Chronology: of the Gospels, 71; of Paul's life, 90.
Chrysostom, condemned, 324.
Church: the first Christian, 83, *seq.;* the Pentecostal, 83; officials of, 85; use of the term in the New Testament, 125, 126; New Testament conditions of membership in, 129; relation of, to kingdom of heaven, 126; pagans flock into, 167; Gnostic teachers excluded from, 193; view of in "1 Clement," 218; Justin's view of, 245; idea of an orthodox, 248; Irenæus' view of, 252; different views regarding discipline, 256, 257; its moral condition in Tertullian's time, 263, 264.
Church buildings, for worship when introduced, 142, 162, 295, 296.
Church: discipline in, at end of eighth century, 429, *seq.;* power of enforcing its decrees, 430, 431.
Church history: defined, 4; its task, 5; what it presupposes, 5; sources of, 9, 10; its history (*a*) ancient, 12, 13, (*b*) mediæval, 13, (*c*) Reformation, 13, 14, (*d*) recent, 14–16; periods of, 16, 17; reasons for its study, 17–19; equipment for its study, 5, 6, 11, 12; schools of, 6–9.
Church organization: helped by Paul, 92; nature of, implied in Philippians, 97; relation to Jewish synagogue, 128, 129; in apostolic times, 131–135; in "Teaching of Twelve," 234; in Justin Martyr, 245; in "Ecclesiastical Constitutions," 289, 290; how influenced by union of Church and State, 314, 315.
Cistercians, mentioned, 455.
Claudius, the Emperor: banishes Jews, 56, 111, 112; conciliates Jews of Palestine, 116.
Claudius of Turin, sketch of, 558.
Clement of Alexandria: his position, 160, 271; life and works of, 273, *seq.;* genius and influence of, 274, 275; contrasted with Tertullian, 279, 280.
Clement of Rome: "First Epistle" of, referred to, 121; discussed and analyzed, 123, 124; authorship, date, etc., 214–219; "Second Epistle" of (so-called), 215.
Clement IV., Pope, 517.
"Clementine Homilies and Recognitions," referred to, 177, 218.
Cleomenes, mentioned, 201.
Cloister life, referred to, 318.
Clovis, sketch of, 404, 405.
Clugny, mentioned, 455.
Cobham, Lord, defends Lollards and suffers martyrdom, 592.
Cœnobitic life, early, 318.
Cœlestius, Pelagian teacher, 363.
Collations, to benefices, 519.
Colossians, Epistle to, 105.
Columba, Irish missionary, 413.
Columban, Irish missionary, 413. *seq.*
Commodus, Emperor, 159, *seq.*
Community of goods among early Christians, 83, *seq.*

Compactata, between the emperor and the Hussites, 533.
Conclave, of Roman Curia, 450.
Concordat of Worms, 510.
Concorricii, a Catharistic party, 546, *seq.*
Confessors, great influence of, 269.
Congregations, Roman, defined, 450.
Conrad of Waldhausen, mentioned, 609.
Consolamentum, a Catharistic rite, 548.
Constance, council of, 529 *seq.*
Constans: referred to, 308; his attitude toward Donatists, 321, 322.
Constantine Copronymus: mentioned, 381; and image-worship, 389, 390.
Constantine the Great: proclaimed Augustus, 170; his motives in adopting Christianity, 305, 306; his policy toward Christianity and toward paganism, 306, 307; his views of Church and State, 307; his attitude toward Donatists, 320, 321; his attitude toward Nicene theology, 330, 331.
Constantius II.: becomes emperor, 308; attacks paganism, 308, 309; referred to, 331.
Constantinople: becomes center of the empire, 308; council of (see Councils); church in, 395, *seq.;* dispute with Rome, 399, *seq.;* defeated by Rome, 402.
Constantinopolitan council, and symbol of Chalcedon, 354.
Constantius, Emperor, 169, *seq.*, 331.
Constitutions of Clarendon, 513.
Corinth: Paul's labors in, 98, 99, 102; state of church in, 99; Clement sends letter to, 123, 215.
Corinthians: Epistles of Paul to, 99 *seq.*, 102; 1 Cor. 16 : 9, 126; 1 Cor. 10 : 16–22, 138; 2 Cor. 10–12, supposed by some to be a separate epistle, 100; lost epistles to, 100; Epistle of Clement of Rome to, 12, *seq.*, 214 *seq.*
Consistory, defined, 450.
Councils: rise of, 294; of Nicæa, 307, 329, 330; of Constantinople, condemns Apollinarianism, 336; of Ephesus, 340, 341; of Ephesus (the second), 346; of Chalcedon, 347 *seq.;* of Nicæa, the second, its deliverances and their fate, 391, 392; of the Lateran, 512, 515, 539, 540, *seq.;* of Lyons, 517, 554; of Pisa, 528; of Constance, 529, 530; of Basel, 530, 531; of Ferrara, 532.
Creeds, beginning of, 300.
Crescens, pagan philosopher: influence of, on M. Aurelius, 156; opposes Justin Martyr, 157.
Crucifixion, date of, 71.
Crusades: discussed, 456, *seq.;* results of, 462, 463; operate against the papacy, 519.
Culture: not possessed by Christians at first, 148; how it helped and how it hindered, 148; growing among Christians, 158; gradually acquired by Christians, 212, 213; spread of, among Christians, 238; high quality of, among Christians at beginning of fourth century, 291; Anglo-Saxons became conservators of, 429; spread of, in Middle Ages, 409.
Cureton, on "Ignatian Epistles," 222, 223.
Curia, Roman, the, discussed, 449–451.
Cyprian: mentioned, 166; life, doctrines, etc., of, 265–271; his views of the church of Rome, 393.
Cyprus, evangelized, 89, 90.
Cyrene, Jews in, 56.
Cyril of Alexandria, opposes Nestorius, 338, *seq.*
Cyrus, king of Persia, helps the Jews, 34.
Cyrus, patriarch of Alexandria, mentioned, 351.

Dalmatius, the monk, supports Cyril, 341.
Damascus, many Jews in, 56.
Damiani, Peter, coadjutor of Hildebrand, 504, 505.
Daniel, apocryphal additions to, 41.
Dante, defends the empire, 522.
Datary, deposed, 450.
"David of Augsburg, Tractate of," mentioned, 576.
Deaconesses: in New Testament, 135; at beginning of fourth century, 293, 294.
Deacons: in New Testament, 134, 135; in Clement, 218; in Polycarp, 233; in Justin Martyr, 245; at beginning of fourth century, 293, 294.
Decius Trajan, referred to, 164–166.
Declaration of faith, the earliest, 249.
"*Defensor Pacis*," of Marsilius of Padua, 584.
Demetrius of Alexandria, opposes Origen, 281.
Demiurge: Plato's view of, 23; in system of Basilides, 186; in system of Valentinus, 188, 189; according to Marcion, 191, 192.
Diana's temple at Ephesus, 101.
"Diatessaron," of Tatian, referred to, 186, 300.
Diocletian, account of, 168–170.
Diodorus of Tarsus, Christology of, 336.
"Diognetus, Epistle to," 237.
Dionysius: of Alexandria, referred to, 288, 289; of Rome, referred to, 324, 325.
Dionysius the Areopagite: tradition about, 98; writings ascribed to, 350.
Dioscurus, patriarch of Alexandria, referred to, 343, 346.
Dispensation, the old, terminated, 118.
Dispensations, referred to, 520.
Dispersion, the Jewish, its causes and extent, 55, 56.
Divine honors claimed by Domitian, 120.

Docetism: in John's time, 123; of Gnostics, 181; of Manichæans, 196.
Döllinger: as a church historian, 16; his views of the Petrobrusians and Henricians criticized, 559.
Domestic happiness, of the Jews, 57.
Dominic, mentioned, 550.
Dominicans, the: mentioned, 455; their place in the Inquisition, 464, 465; rise of mysticism among, 486.
Domitian, Emperor: mentioned, 120; perhaps referred to in Revelation, 121.
Donatism: referred to, 169; history of, 320–323.
Donatist controversy, described, 320 *seq.*
Donatists, the: discussed, 208–210; persecution of, 321, 322.
Donatus, mentioned, 209.
Dorotheus, referred to, 168.
Dualism of Zoroaster, how it helps morality, 37.
Duns Scotus, sketch of, 483, 484.
Dryer, as a church historian, 16.
Dyothelites, compared with Monothelites, 354, 355.
Dyothelitism triumphant, 355.

East, the: at close of eighth century, 423, *seq.;* compared with West, 424, *seq.*
Easter, celebration of, 299.
Easter controversy: rise of, 158; in time of Irenæus, 252.
Ebionism: alluded to in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 116; in John's time, 123; origin and principles of, 174, *seq.*
Ebrard, mentioned, 15.
Ecclesia (ἐκκλησία), 125.
"Ecclesiastical Annals," mentioned, 14.
"Ecclesiastical Constitutions," discussed, 289, 290.
Ecclesiasticus, referred to, 42.
Eckhart, views of, 487, *seq.*
Eckhart, influence of, on Brethren of the Free Spirit, 557.
Eclecticism: of Philo, 60; of Heliogabalus, 161; of Alexander Severus, 162.
"Ecthesis," The, of the Emperor Heraclius, 352, *seq.*
Edificatory writings of first to third century, 213, *seq.*
Education: promoted by study of church history, 17; religious, vigorously prosecuted after exile, 38; Christian, makes progress, 162; at beginning of fourth century, 296, 297; forbidden by Julian, 309.
Edward III. and the papacy, 603, 604.
Egypt and the Jews, 39, 40, 56.
Egyptian theosophy, relation of, to Gnosticism, 182.
Elders: silence of New Testament regarding introduction of, 127; place of, in "1 Clement," 124, 217; in New Testament, 133, 134; identical with bishops, 134; place of, in "Hermas," 231; place of, in Polycarp, 233; at beginning of fourth century, 293, 294; Cyprian the first to distinguish from bishops, 266.
Election, Augustine's view of, 367.
Elias of Cortona, referred to, 553, 554.
Elkesaites, referred to, 177.
Emperor, election of, in Middle Ages, 442, 443.
Emperors, The Roman: list of, 150, *seq.;* their varying attitude toward Christianity, 150; which of them became Christians, 163; their aim in persecuting during third century, 167.
"Enoch, Book of," discussed, 43, 44.
Enthusiasm: early Christian, 142; distasteful to philosophers, 150.
Ephesians, Epistle to, 105.
Ephesus, Paul at, 99–101; council of. (See Council.)
Epicureanism, its place and influence, 26, 27.
Epigonus, mentioned, 201.
Epimeletes (ἐπιμελητής), in pagan organizations, 129.
Epiphanius, attitude of, toward Origen, 333, 334.
Epiphany, feast of, its origin, 299.
Episcopacy: in "Ignatian Epistles," 226–228; in Irenæus, 252; in time of Tertullian, 263; development of, under Cyprian, 266, 267; history of its growth, 266, 267; stimulated by union of Church and State, 314.
Episcopate, monarchical: rise of, 155; growth of, 158.
Episcopos (ἐπίσκοπος). in pagan organizations, 129.
Eschatology: the Jewish, 63, 64; of Thessalonians, 97, 98; of 2 Peter, 108; of Montanists, 205; of "1 Clement," 217; of Irenæus, 250; of Origen, 285, 286. (See also Judgment.)
1 Esdras, referred to, 41.
Esoteric philosophy of Egypt, enters the current of thought, 28.
Essenes: discussed, 50, *seq.;* their teaching and that of Jesus, 52, 53.
Esther, apocryphal additions to, 41.
Eteroousios (ἑτεροούσιος), 327.
Ethelbert, converted, 411.
Ethiopia, Jews in, 56.
Eucharist, yearly observance of, made obligatory, 518.
Eudo de Stella, sketch of, 567, 568.
Eugenius, mentioned, 531, 532.
Eusebius, referred to, 12, 332.
Eustathius, mentioned, 373.
Eutychean controversy, described, 343, *seq.*
Eutyches, discussed, 343, *seq.*
Evagrius, referred to, 13.
Evangelical doctrines, survival of, in pre-Reformation times, 541, *seq.*
Evangelical separatism of Middle Ages, 557, *seq.*

Evangelists, in New Testament, 133.
Exorcists, at beginning of fourth century, 294.
Expectancies, referred to, 520.
Ezra, his reforms, 25.

Fairbairn, his estimate of the character and influence of Jesus, 79.
Fasting, in "Teaching of the Twelve," 236.
Faustus of Lerins, attacks Augustinianism, 370.
Feet-washing, referred to, 140.
Felicissimus, referred to, 269, 270.
Felicitas, referred to, 161.
Felix, referred to, 104, 116.
Felix V., mentioned, 553, 554.
Festivals, ecclesiastical, multiplication of, 299.
Festus, referred to, 104, 116.
Fetichism, at beginning of fourth century, 292.
Feudalism, discussed, 443, *seq.*
Fisher, referred to, 16.
Flavia Domitilla, referred to, 120, 142.
Flavian, mentioned, 346.
Flavius Clemens, referred to, 120, 215.
Florentius, mentioned, 617, 618.
Florus, referred to, 117.
Forgeries, documentary, referred to, 447.
France, in the Middle Ages, 442.
Francis of Assisi, referred to, 553, *seq.*
Franciscans, the: mentioned, 455; parties among, 553, *seq.*
Fravashi, referred to, 37.
Frederick Barbarossa, 512.
Frederick II., 516.
Freedmen, referred to, 444.
Freemen, referred to, 444.
Free-will: in Pharisaism, 49; in "Clementines," 178; Wycliffe's view of, 606; views of "Brethren of Common Life" concerning, 618. (See also Will.)
Fronto, influence of, on Marcus Aurelius, 156.
Fulgentius, mentioned, 371.
Fullness of time, discussed, 67.
Funk, mentioned, 16.

Galatians, Epistle to, discussed, 95.
Gallicanism, origin of, 517.
Gallienus, mentioned, 167.
Galerius: expels Christians from the army, 168; as emperor, 169, 170.
Galilee, welcomes Jesus, 76.
Gallus, mentioned, 166.
Geiger, on Pharisees and Sadducees, 48.
Gelasius, referred to, 400, 401.
Gentiles, their place discussed, 93, 94.
German writers of church history, 16.
Germany, in Middle Ages, 442.
Gerson, John, referred to, 527.
Gherardo, mentioned, 554.
Ghibbeline, origin of the term, 511.
Gieseler, referred to, 15.
Gladiatorial shows, suppressed by influence of Christianity, 312.
Gnostic views, adopted by Tatian, 246.
Gnosticism: Christianity organized to meet, 155; its history and principles, 180, *seq.;* its influence on Christian life and thought, 193, 194; Montanism a reaction against, 202; refuted by Irenæus, 249, 250; attacked by Tertullian, 259; influences of, on Christian worship, 296.
Gnostics: influenced by Pythagoras, 21, 22; influenced by Philo, 62; influence of, in second century, 247.
God: Jewish doctrine of, 57; Philo's idea of, 60; Gnostic idea of, 187; Justin's view of, 244; Irenæus' view of, 250, 251; Tertullian's view of, 260; Clement's view of, 277; Origen's view of, 283, 284.
Gods, Greek ideas of, 21.
Gorgonios, mentioned, 168.
Gospels: discussed, 119; their canonicity recognized by Irenæus, 250.
Grace, Augustine's view of, 367; Pelagian view of, 365.
Gratian, mentioned, 310.
Greece: its contribution to the world's culture, 20–27; the Jews in, 56.
Greek culture: spread by Alexander's conquests, 27; influence of, in Clement of Alexandria, 273, 274.
Greek language: its diffusion, 27; used by early Christian writers, 255.
Greek literature, how used by the apologists, 239; and the Renaissance, 493.
Greek philosophy: history of, 21–27; its influence on Roman thought, 31; related to the Old Testament by Philo, 59; influence of, on Alexandrian school, 272; ascribed by Clement to the Son, 278.
Greek religion: its nature, 20, 21; fails to satisfy the heart, 28, 29.
Greeks: contrasted with Romans, 29; influence their Roman conquerors, 30.
Gregory the Great: fixes orthodoxy, 371; sketch of, 405, *seq.;* his interest in Britain, 411.
Gregory II., referred to, 388, 389.
Gregory III., referred to, 389.
Gregory IV., referred to, 497.
Gregory IX., referred to, 516.
Gregory X., referred to, 517, 518.
Gregory XII., mentioned, 527, 528.
Gregory, founder of the Bohemian Brethren, 594, *seq.*
Gregory Nazianzen: mentioned, 329, 333; Christology of, 335, 336.
Gregory of Nyssa: mentioned, 333; Christology of, 335, 336.
Gregory Thaumaturgus, life and works of, 287, 288.
Grossetête, Robert, work and influence of, 601, 602.
Groot, Gerhard, mentioned, 617, 618.
Guelf, origin of the term, 511.
Guilds, Græco-Roman, their influence on church organization, 128

Gymnasium, erected in Jerusalem, 46.

Hadrian: reign of, 153, 154; rescript of, 153.
Hadrian II., referred to, 498.
Harnack: his place in historiography, 16; on the mode of baptism, 136; his view of the "Ignatian Epistles" discussed, 223–226.
Hase, mentioned, 15.
Hauck, on the mode of baptism, 136.
Haurvatat (wholeness), mentioned, 37.
Hebrews, Epistle to: author of, 110, 111; summary of, 115, 116; gospel according to, 177.
Hegisippus, mentioned, 12.
Heliodorus, referred to, 45.
Heliogabalus, referred to, 161, 162.
Heliopolis, referred to, 40.
Hell, in Zoroastrianism, 37.
Hellenistic influences: dominated the Roman Empire, 28; reach the Jews through Macedonian conquest, 39.
Henricians, the, sketch of, 557, *seq.*
Henry the Fowler, mentioned, 441, 442.
Henry II. (of England), referred to, 512, 513.
Henry IV., mentioned, 505, 506.
Henry of Lausanne, referred to, 549, *seq.*; sketch of, 560, *seq.*
Heraclius, and the Monophysites, 351.
Heresy: attacked by Irenæus, 249, *seq.*; becomes a crime, 464.
Hergenröther, mentioned, 16.
Hermas: mentioned, 228; "Shepherd" of, 228–231.
Hermias, mentioned, 237.
Hermit life, referred to, 317.
Hertzog, mentioned, 15.
Hilary of Arles, referred to, 398.
Hildebrand: his influence in developing the papacy, 502, *seq.*; his achievements, 505; his claims regarding papal prerogative, 506–508; views of, on civil and religious liberty, 508, 509; his attitude regarding investiture, 510.
Hippolytus: referred to, 163; life, writings, etc., of, 252–257.
Historical perspective, Philo's lack of, 60.
History, defined, 3.
Holy Ghost, Catharistic views of, 548, *seq.*
Holy Roman Empire, the, discussed, 439, *seq.*
Holy Spirit: Justin's view of, 244; Irenæus' view of, 251; Clement of Alexandria's view of, 278; Origen's view of, 284. (See also Paraclete.)
Hormisdas, work of, 402.
Honorius, Pope, Monothelitic views of, 352.
Hospitalers, the, mentioned, 455.
Humiliati, the, sketch of, 566.
Hurst, referred to, 16.
Huss, John: sketch of, 613, *seq.*; reasons for his condemnation, 615, 616; views of, 616.
Hussite movement, the, 609, *seq.*
Hussites, the, persecution of, 530, *seq.*
Hvar, mentioned, 37.
Hymns, among early Christians, 151.
Hymn writers, before end of eighth century, 429.

Ibas, vindicated, 349.
Ichthus (ΙΧΘΥΣ), a symbol for Christ, 262.
Iconoclastic controversy, outlined, 386, *seq.*
"Ignatius, Epistles of," their authenticity and contents, 222–228.
Images, use of, in East and West, 392, 426.
Image-worship: origin and causes of, 386, 387; arguments for and against, 388, 389; history of, 389, *seq.*
Immortality: Pharisees' view of, 48; pre-Christian belief in, 63.
Incarnation, Philo sees no need of, 62. (See also Christology.)
Indulgences: doctrine of, stimulated by Manichæans, 197; to crusaders, referred to, 520.
Infant baptism: not practised in apostolic churches, 136; probably not practised by Ebionites, 179, 180; Pelagian view of, 364. (See also Baptism.)
Informers: discouraged by Trajan, 152: discouraged by Hadrian, 153; discouraged by Antoninus Pius, 155; encouraged by M. Aurelius, 158.
Innocent I., attitude toward Pelagians, 368.
Innocent III.: reign of, 513, *seq.*; extirpates the Cathari, 550, *seq.*
Innocent IV., referred to, 517.
Innocent VIII., pontificate of, 537.
Inquisition, The: discussed, 436, *seq.*; operates against the papacy, 519; information preserved by, 543, *seq.*
Intermediate State, in Jewish eschatology, 64.
Interpretation of Scripture: principles of, according to Irenæus, 249; Origen's principles of, 286. (See also Allegorical Method.)
Investiture, controversy regarding, 442, 509, 510.
Irenæus, life, works, and doctrines of, 248–252.
Irene, and image-worship, 390, 391.
Isaiah 45: 5–7, 36; and 42: 1–14, 78.
Italy, in Middle Ages, 442.

James: at Jerusalem conference, 93, 109; pastor of Jerusalem church, 109; his attitude toward Mosaic law, 109; traditions of his holiness, 109; tradition of his death, 110.
Jason, mentioned, 46.
Jehoshaphat, Saint, mentioned, 240.
"Jeremiah," apocryphal letter of, 42.
Jerome: his attitude toward Origen, 333, *seq.*; his attitude toward the Pelagians, 368; the triumph of his

views, 371; attitude toward asceticism, 372; attitude toward Jovinianus, 374, *seq.;* Vigilantius visits, 377; opposes Vigilantius, 377, *seq.*
Jerusalem: desecrated, 46; conference at, 92-94; church at, 109; destruction of, 110, *seq.;* influence of church at, 130, 131.
Jesus Christ: his place, work, and doctrines, 67-80; satisfies the yearnings of the heart, 68; duration and divisions of his public ministry, 71, 72; his conception of his life-work, 72, 73; his methods of teaching, 74; his works of power, 74, 75; his rejection and its cause, 75, 76; his trial and crucifixion, 76, 77; his resurrection and ascension, 77; results of his ministry, 76; Stalker, Bruce, Fairbairn, Beyschlag, and Wendt on his character and influence, 78-80; his bust placed in chapel by Alex. Severus, 162; his divinity insisted on, 175; views of, among Ebionites, 175, 176; his place in the "Clementines," 177, 178; his place in Gnosticism, 184; his place in system of Valentinus, 189; his place among the Alogoi, 198; Paul of Samosata's view of, 199; Mohammed's view of, 433. (See also Christology.)
Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy: referred to, 59; John's relation to, 122; influences Gnosticism, 181, 182; traces of, in "Barnabas," 221.
Jews: cease to be a nation, 118; lose political influence, 119; forbidden by Hadrian to enter Palestine, 154.
Joachim of Floris: sketch of, 551, 552; influence of, 554, 555.
John, Gospel of: prologue to, compared with Philo, 62; discussed, 119; relation of, to Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy, 122.
John Hyrcanus, referred to, 47.
John III., referred to, 498.
John IV., Pope, repudiates Monothelitism, 353.
John of Antioch, attitude in the Nestorian controversy, 340, 341.
John of England, some account of, 514, 515.
John of Parma, referred to, 554.
John of Wesel, sketch of, 620.
John of Wessel, sketch of, 620, 621.
John Pupper of Goch, sketch of, 619, 620.
John the Apostle: meagreness of information regarding, 110; banishment of, 121; residence of, at Ephesus, 122; Polycarp's memories of, 232.
John the Baptist, referred to, 69, 70.
John (1), the Epistle, 2:18, 20, 23 and 4:2, referred to, 123.
John XXII., referred to, 525.
John XXIII., referred to, 529.
Jonathan, mentioned, 46.
Josephus, describes destruction of Jerusalem, 117.
Jovinian, survival of his doctrine, 559.
Jovinianist controversy, outlined, 374, *seq.*
Jovinianus, life and doctrine of, 374, *seq.*
"Jubilees, Book of," referred to, 44.
Judaism: its spread and methods, 57; not an obscure sect, 58; deathblow of its influence on Christianity, 154; enjoys a revival, 175; crushed, 175; struggles in the "Clementines" for ascendency, 177; Marcion's enmity toward, 192; in Montanism, 203; in "Barnabas," 220, 221.
Judaizers: discussed, 94, 95; at Corinth, 100; their influence in Ebionism, 174, *seq.*
Judas Maccabæus, referred to, 46.
Jude, referred to, 110.
Jude 12, 138.
Judea: turns away from Jesus, 76; procurators of, 116.
Judgment: in Zoroastrianism, 37; in Pharisaism, 48. (See also Eschatology.)
Judith, referred to, 42.
Julia Domna, her influence on religious policy, 161.
Julia Mammæa, mentioned, 161, 162, 163.
Julia Moesa, mentioned, 161.
Julian the Apostate, reign of, 309, 310.
Julian of Eclanum, referred to, 368, 369.
Julius II., sketch of, 538, 539.
Justin I., mentioned, 402.
Justin Martyr: "Apology" of, 155, 242, 243; martyrdom of, 157; life of, 241, 242; "Dialogue with Trypho," 244.
Justinian: suppresses Origenism, 334, 335; and the "Three Chapters," 348; in relation to the papacy, 402, *seq.*

"Key of Truth, The," 356, 385.
Khshathra Vairya, referred to, 36.
Kingdom, Messianic: Jesus' view of, 72, 73; its relation to the church, 126. (See also Eschatology.)
Kraus, mentioned, 16.
Kurtz, mentioned, 15.

Lapsi, the: referred to, 166; Cyprian's attitude toward, 268-271.
Lateran: council of, 512; fourth council of, 515, *seq.*
Lateran Council, 539, 540.
Latin, Tertullian among the first to use it for theology, 257, 258.
Law, ceremonial observance of, ceases, 118.
Legates, papal, used by Hildebrand, 505, 506.
Leo the Great: sketch of, 397, *seq.;* his letter to Flavian, 344, *seq.*
Leo III., crowns Charlemagne, 496.
Leo X., sketch of, 539, 540.
Leo the Isaurian: mentioned, 381; his views of image worship, 387, 389.

Leontopolis, temple of, 118.
Leudes, referred to, 444.
Libellatici, referred to, 166.
Liberty, religious: its earliest concession by a civil government, 171; attitude of Augustine and Ambrose toward, 311.
Library of Alexandria, referred to, 27.
Licinius, mentioned, 170, 172.
Lightfoot, his view of "Ignatian Epistles" discussed, 223–226.
Linus, mentioned, 215.
Litanies, Zoroastrian like Catholic, 37. (See also Worship.)
Logoi, Stoic, in Philo, 61.
Logos: in Zorastrianism, 36; Philo's idea of, 61, 62, 182; Mani's view of, 196; among the *Alogoi*, 198; Paul of Samosata's view of, 199; Clement's view of, 278; Origen's view of, 284; importance of, for Christian theology, 324, *seq.*; Arian view of, 327; various views of, in fourth century, 335, 336. (See also Christology.)
Lollards, the, sketch of, 589–593.
Loofs, referred to, 16.
Lord's Day: recognition of, in early churches, 141; relation of, to Sabbath, 141; in "Teaching of the Twelve," 236; in Justin Martyr, 245.
Lord's Supper: institution of, 137, *seq.*; relation of, to paschal meal, 137; early abuses of, 138; not often mentioned in New Testament, 139; participants in, 139; minute quantities of bread and wine in, 139; separation of love feast from, 140; administered in Catacombs, 167; water used in, by Tatian, 186; in "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," described, 236; in "Ecclesiastical Constitutions," 290; Chelcicky on, 588, *seq.*; Wycliffe's view of, 606, 607; Huss' view of, 616.
Lord's Prayer, use of, in ritual, 296.
Lot, decision by, among the Bohemian Brethren, 595, 597.
Lothair, Emperor, referred to, 440, 441, 497.
Louis the Pious, mentioned, 440, 447, 496.
Love-feast, referred to, 137, 138, 140.
Lucilla, mentioned, 209.
Lukas of Prague, mentioned, 599.
Luke, referred to, 111; Gospel of, 21 : 20–28, discussed, 119.
Lyons, council of, 517, 518.
Lyons, persecution of church at, 157.

Maccabees: books of, 42; struggles of, 44.
Macedonia, Jews in, 56.
Macedonian conquest, its influence on the Jews, 39.
Macedonian period, monuments of, in Jewish history, 40, *seq.*
Macrinus, mentioned, 161.
"Magdeburg Centuries," referred to, 13.
Mah, mentioned, 37.
Majorinus, mentioned, 209.
"Manasses, Prayer of," referred to, 41.
Mani, referred to, 195.
Manichæism: Diocletian's decree against, 168; influenced by Marcion, 193; origin and doctrines of, 194–197; its influence on Christianity, 197.
Marcia, referred to, 159, 160.
Marcian, mentioned, 347.
Marcion: sketch of, 191–193; his relation to New Testament canon, 300.
Marcus Aurelius, reign of, 156–159.
Mark: his experience in mission work, 96; his relation to Alexandria, 110.
Mark, Gospel of: referred to, 119; Peter's relation to, 108; when written, 110.
Marsilius of Padua, sketch of, 584–586.
Martin V., referred to, 529, 530.
Martin of Tours, helps asceticism, 371.
Martyrdom: of Stephen, 85, 86; of Peter and Paul, 106; of Justin Martyr, 157. (See also Persecutions.)
Mattathias and his sons, referred to, 46, 47.
Matthew: referred to, 110: Gospel of, referred to, 119; 21 : 43, 119; 23 : 37–39, 119; 16 : 18, 125; 18 : 17. *seq.*, 126.
Matter, Philo's idea of, 60, 61.
Matthias of Janow, sketch of, 610–612.
Maxentius, mentioned, 170.
Maximian, mentioned, 169, 170.
Maximilla, mentioned, 204.
Maximinus the Thracian, mentioned, 163; referred to, 170.
Maximus, a defender of Dyothelitism, 353, *seq.*
Mediæval civilization, discussed, 437, *seq.*
Media, many Jews in, 56.
Melito, referred to, 237.
Memnon, attitude of, on Nestorian controversy, 340, 341.
Menander, mentioned, 185.
Menelaus, mentioned, 46.
Mensurius, mentioned, 209.
Merovingian kingdom, the, referred to, 404, 405.
Merswin, Rulmann, referred to, 490.
Mesopotamia, many Jews in, 56.
Messiah, Jewish conception of, 63.
Messianic hope: in "Enoch," 44; in Judaism generally, 62-64.
Messianic programme of Jesus, 72.
Methodius, rejects Origen's views, 332.
Middle Ages, The, not a time of retrogression, 438.
Milan, edict of: mentioned, 171; its effect on Christianity, 306, 307.
Militsch of Kremsier, sketch of, 609, 610.
Millenarianism, in Middle Ages, 551.
Milvian Bridge, battle of, 171.
Miracles of Jesus, referred to, 74.
Miracle-working, ascribed to Gregory Thaumaturgus, 288.

Missionary methods among early Christians, 142, 143.
Missions, spirit of, in Britain, 412, *seq.*
Mithra, referred to, 37.
Mithras-worship: referred to, 292; influence of, on Christianity, 296; nature of, 305.
Modalism, discussed, 200, *seq.*
Moeller, mentioned, 15.
Mohammedanism, history and doctrines of, 431, *seq.*
Monarchianism: Dynamistic, explained, 198–200; Modalistic, discussed and explained, 198, 200–202; its spread and influence, 258, 259.
Monasticism: among Essenes, 50; Tertullian the forerunner of, 280; its place in Christianity, 316, *seq.;* its grades and its effects, 317-319; of East and West contrasted, 425; mediæval, described and discussed, 451, *seq.;* defined, 452; in Wycliffe's day, 604, 605.
Monobazus of Adiabene, mentioned, 58.
Monophysitism: Theodoret opposes, 343; further history of, 348, 350, 351.
Monothelite controversy, history of, 349, *seq.*
Montanism: rise of, 155, 158; characteristics, origin, doctrines, and influence of, 202–205; Tertullian goes over to, 258–260; influences Christianity through Tertullian, 260.
Montanists, their attitude toward heretical baptism, 270.
Montanus, referred to, 204.
Montpelier, University of, 470.
Mosheim, mentioned, 14.
Müller, Karl, mentioned, 16.
Mysteries, Greek, their influence on Christian worship, 296.
Mysticism: of Julia Domna and her associates, 161; mediæval, 485, *seq.*

Name, the, persecution for, 115, 154.
Nazarenes, referred to, 176, 177.
Neander, referred to, 15.
Nehemiah, his reforms, 34.
Neo-Cæsarea, the home of Gregory Thaumaturgus, 287.
Neo-Platonism, Origen's relation to, 280, 281.
Nepotism, referred to, 520.
Nero: gentle in early years, 112; Paul appeals to, 112; his later cruelty, 112, 113; persecutes Christians, 113; influence of Jews on, 114; belief that he would return, 121.
Neronian persecution, referred to in Revelation, 121.
Nestorian controversy, its nature and history, 337–339.
Nestorius, his views, etc., 337–342.
New Jerusalem, Jewish expectation of, 64.
New Testament: canon of, 211, 212; how regarded in first and third centuries, 214; place of, in Polycarp, 233; place of, in "Teaching of the Twelve," 235, 236; as used by polemical writers, 247; its connection with Old Testament in view of Irenæus, 250; its place in first and third centuries, 300, 301. (See also Scriptures.)
Nicene Council. (See Council.)
Nicomedia, persecution at, 169.
Nicholas I., referred to, 498.
Nicholas V., mentioned, 534, 535.
Nicholas of Hussinetz, mentioned, 582.
Niedner, referred to, 15.
Noëtian heresy, described, 256.
Noëtus, referred to, 201.
Nominalism, referred to, 476, 477.
Normans, importance of their conversion, 456, 457.
Novatianists, described, 206, 207.
Novatian, referred to, 207.
Novatian schism, referred to, 167.
Novatus, referred to, 269.

Occam, William of, sketch of, 484, 485.
Officers of church: election of, 85; in apostolic days, 131–135; in "1 Clement," 218. (See also Bishop, Elder, and Deacon.)
Oldcastle, Sir John, defends Lollards, 592.
Old Testament: canon of, 39; related to Greek philosophy by Philo, 59; Marcion's view of, 192; attitude of Manichæism toward, 197; how regarded in first and third centuries, 214; how used in "1 Clement," 216; how used in "Barnabas," 220, 221; place of, in Polycarp, 233; place of, in "Teaching of the Twelve," 235, 236; use of, by apologists, 239; Tatian's view of, 246; Irenæus' defense and use of, 250; Clement's view of its use by Greeks, 276, 277; its place in first and third centuries, 300; influence of, in stimulating persecution, 315. (See also Scriptures.)
Olivi, Pierre Jean, mentioned, 555.
Omoiousios (ὁμοιούσιος), 329.
Omoousios (ὁμοούσιος), 328, 344.
Onesimus, referred to, 105.
Onias, mentioned, 40.
Onias III., mentioned, 46.
Ordinances: of apostolic churches, 135; perverted, 292.
Ordination, need of, felt by Bohemian Brethren, 598.
Organization of churches. (See Church Organization.)
Oriental religions: emigrate to Rome, 31, 32; Romans receive, 57.
Origen: saved from martyrdom, 160; instructs Julia Mammæa, 162; at Cæsarea, 163; at Alexandria, 271; life, works, and doctrine of, 280–287; influence of, on Christian thought, 286, 287; fate of his views after his death, 332–335; school of, 272; influences Clement, 277; influences Apollinaris, 336.
Ormazd, referred to, 36.

Ortidiebarians, mentioned, 557, 572.
Otho the Great: restores the empire, 441, 442; seeks to reform the papacy, 500, *seq.*
Otto, of Freising, mentioned, 564.
Oxford, University of, 470.

Pachomius: rules of, 318, 319; attitude of, toward Origen, 332.
Pagan writers, begin to study Christianity, 159.
Paganism: becomes alarmed, 156; not repudiated by edict of Milan, 171; amalgamated with Christian thought, 194; in time of Constantine, 291; how treated by Constantine, 306, 307; adherence of aristocracy to, 307; attacked by Constantius II., 308; restored by Julian, 309; its victory in defeat, 311, 313, 314.
Pagans, flock into Christian churches, 167.
Pamphilus, mentioned, 332.
Pantænus, mentioned, 271; Clement's opinion of, 273.
Pantheistic heresy of Middle Ages, 555–557.
Papacy; important victory for, 346; rise and growth of, 393, *seq.;* the circumstances favoring it, 386, *seq.;* impeccability claimed for, 401; Justinian's attitude toward, 403, 404; and the Merovingians, 404, 405; and Gregory the Great, 405, *seq.*, and the Carlovingians, 406; effect of Crusades upon, 462, 463; effect of Inquisition upon, 468, 469; during the Middle Ages, 495, *seq.;* developed by Hildebrand, 502, *seq.;* position of, at death of Innocent III., 518; decline of, 518, *seq.;* in Babylonish captivity, 523, *seq.* (see also Roman Catholicism); its relation to councils, 532, 533; immediately before the Reformation, 537; its claims to Scotland rejected, 602; the attitude of Edward III. toward, 603; Wycliffe's attitude toward, 604, *seq.;* in Bohemia, 608, *seq.;* Militsch's view of, 610; Matthias' attitude toward, 611; Huss' views of, 616.
Papal schism, the, discussed, 525, 526.
Papias, Fragments of, 237.
Paraclete: Simon Magus regarded as, 185; Mani professes to be, 195; Montanistic view of, 205. (See also Holy Spirit.)
Parendi, mentioned, 37.
Paris, University of, 470, 472.
Parties, in Christianity, 173, 174.
"Passau Anonymous, The," referred to, 575.
Patrick, sketch of, 412, 413.
Patripassianism; referred to, 202; spread and influence of, 258, 259.
Paul: first appearance of, 86; a persecutor, 88; conversion and events following, 88, 89; enters mission field, 90; origin of his name, 91; first missionary journey, 91, 92; at Jerusalem conference, 93; rebukes Judaizers, 94; second missionary journey, 96; third missionary journey, 100; opposition to him shows success of his work, 103; at Troas, 102; last visit to Jerusalem, 103, 104; plot against, 104; imprisonment at Cæsarea, 104; appeals to Cæsar, 104; voyage to Rome, 104; imprisonment at Rome, 104; martyrdom of, 106, 216; date of his death, 115.
Paul of Samosata, referred to, 197–199.
Paulician controversy, outlined, 379, *seq.*
Paulicianism, influenced by Marcion, 193; foregleams of, 374; outline of, 381, *seq.;* historical sketch of, 386, *seq.;* the fatefulness of its suppression, 385; the influence of, 385.
Paulicians: mentioned, 199; referred to, 356, 357; sketch of, 379, *seq.;* connection of, with the Reformation, 541, *seq.*
Paulinus of Nola: and asceticism, 371; influences Vigilantius, 377.
Pelagian controversy, outlined, 362, *seq.*
Pelagianism: Clement of Alexandria the forerunner of, 280; antecedents of, 359, *seq.*
Pelagians: views of, 363, *seq.;* proceedings against, 368, 369.
Pelagius, characterized, 362.
Pella, referred to, 118.
Penitentiary, defined, 450.
Pentecost: referred to, 82; as a Christian festival, 299.
Pepin: his attitude toward the papacy, 406, *seq.;* referred to, 417, 418.
Perpetua, mentioned, 161.
Persecution: the first general, 86, 87; the first imperial (Neronian), 111–115; under Domitian, 120, 121; relation of, to spread of gospel, 148; causes of, 148–150; under Marcus Aurelius, 156–159; at Lyons and Vienne, 157; at Pergamus, 157, 158; under Sept. Severus, 160; under Maximinus, 163; under Decius, 164–166; under Valerian, 166, 167; during third century, remarks on, 167; under Maximinus in the East, 170; gives rise to Novatianism and Donatism, 207, 208; under Julian, 310; of heresy, etc., by Christians, 315, 316, 321.
Perseverance, Augustine's view of, 367.
Persians: their contact with the Jews, 36, 37; their influence on Jewish thought, 38, 39, 53, 54; invade the Roman Empire, 350, 351.
Peter: spokesman of apostles, 82; early ministry of, 89; at Jerusalem conference, 93; at Antioch, 94; after Jerusalem conference, 106; Paul's influence over, 106; at Rome, 107;

traditions of death of, 107; relations to Asia Minor, 107; relation to Mark, 108; apocryphal works ascribed to, 108; relation to Roman Church, 108; date of death of, 115; "1 Clement" on death of, 216: First Epistle of, 106; 2 : 13–17, 112; Second Epistle of, 108; place of, in the canon, 108; 2 : 13, 138.
Peter de Bruys: referred to, 549, 550; sketch of, 560.
Peter Chelcicky, work and views of, 586-589.
Peter the Hermit, mentioned, 458.
Peter Lombard, mentioned, 479.
Peter the Venerable, mentioned, 560, 561.
Peter Waldo, sketch of, 570, 571.
Petrobrusians, the, sketch of, 557, *seq.*
Pharisaism, discussed, 47, 48.
Pharisees: nearer than Sadducees to doctrines of Jesus, 48; their characteristic teachings, 48, 49; oppose Jesus, 75, 76.
Philemon: ver. 2, explained, 126; referred to, 105.
Philip, referred to, 86, 87, 103, 110.
Philip, the Arabian, referred to, 163.
Philip the Fair, referred to, 521, 522.
Philippi: Paul's work at, 96; Paul's relations with church at, 97.
Philippians, Epistle to: referred to, 97, 105; 4 : 3, 215; 4 : 15, 126.
"Philippians, Polycarp's Epistle to," discussed, 231, 233.
Philo: his place in the history of thought, 28; methods, views, etc., of, 59-62; lacks historical perspective, 60; his view of the Logos, 182, 183.
Philostratus, referred to, 161.
Phœnicia, evangelized, 89, 90.
Pisa, council of, 528.
"*Pistis Sophia*," referred to, 189.
Pius II.: mentioned, 543; sketch of, 536.
Plato, "the philosopher of the Spirit": his place in philosophy, 23; his views, 23, 24; his influence on Jewish and on Christian thought, 23, 24; Goethe's opinion of, 23; Eusebius' opinion of, 24; Westcott's opinion of, 24; influence of, on Philo, 60, 61; influence on "Clementines," 178; influences Gnosticism, 181; his views attacked by Irenæus, 249; influences Alexandrian thought, 272; influences Scotus Erigena, 475, 476; influences Arabic philosophy, 479; inuences the Mystics, 485; influences leaders of New Learning, 492.
Pliny, correspondence of, with Trajan, 151.
Podiebrad, proceeds against the Bohemian Brethren, 596, 598.
Polemical Period, discussed, 246, *seq*
"Polycarp, Epistle of": discussed, 332-233; referred to, 155, 132.
Pompey, takes Jews to Rome, 56.
Pontianus, mentioned, 163.
Pontifex Maximus: among the Romans, 30; Augustus becomes, 31; equivalent of, in State Church, 307.
Poor Men of Lombardy, referred to, 571.
Poor Men of Lyons, the: referred to, 566; relation of, to Poor Men of Lombardy, 571, *seq.*
Pornocracy, the, outlined, 499, 500.
Præmunire, Statute of, 603.
Pragmatic Sanction, the: adopted, 538; withdrawn, 540.
Praxeas, discussed, 201, 258, 259.
Prayer: in "Teaching of the Twelve," 236: forms of, how introduced, 296.
Predestination: in Pharisaism, 49; Augustine's view of, 367.
Presbyter. (See Elders.)
Priests, among the Romans, 29, 30.
Prisca, mentioned, 108.
Priscilla, Montanist prophetess, 204.
Prophecy, Old Testament, its importance for the apologists, 239.
Prophets, place and authority of, in New Testament, 132, 133.
Proselytes Jewish: nature and numbers of, 57, 58; two classes of, 58.
Proselytism, early Christians charged with, 149.
Prosōpon (πρόσωπον), referred to, 257.
Protestants, before the Reformation, 543, *seq.*
Provisors, Statute of, 603.
"Psalter of Solomon," mentioned, 43.
Pseudepigrapha: discussed, 42-44; their number, 43; still written in second and third centuries, 44.
Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, the, discussed, 447, 448.
Ptolemies, the: promote learning, 27; found Jewish colonies, 28; have Old Testament translated into Greek, 28; considerate to Jews, 60.
Pulcheria, mentioned, 347.
Purgatory: in Zoroastrianism, 37: in "Clementines," 178; germs of, in "Hermas," 231.
Pythagoras: the basis of his philosophy, 21; his influence on the Gnostics, 21; propagation of his ideas, 22; influence on early Christian thought, 22. (See also Pythagoreanism.)
Pythagoreanism: and Essenism, 53, 54; in Philo, 60; in the "Clementines," 178; in Gnosticism, 181.

Quadratus, mentioned, 237.
Quod ubique, etc., the first use of, 370.

Ramsay, his South Galatian view, 95.
Rashnu, mentioned, 37.
Realism, 476.
Redemption, promise of, by Jews, 57.
Reformation, the: precursors of, 541, *seq.*; preparation for, 600.
Reformers, before the Reformation, 619, *seq.*

Relics, worship of, 209.
Religion, its influence on its adherents, 4.
Religious yearnings: not satisfied by Greece or the East, 29, 31, 32, 67; satisfied by Christ, 68.
Renaissance, sketch of, 490, *seq.*
Repentance, its relation to the Messianic kingdom, 63.
Reprobation, Augustine's view of, 367.
Reservations, papal, 520.
Resurrection: in Zoroastrianism, 37; in Pharisaism, 48; pre-Christian belief in, 63; place of, in early Christian preaching, 83, 84.
Revelation, book of: reason for its obscurity, 113; its date, 121, 122: 6 : 9, *seq.*, explained, 121; 17 : 11, explained, 121; 17 : 5, explained, 122.
Réville, on "Ignatian Epistles," 223.
Rhenish dissenters, the, referred to, 568.
Rhoda, in "Hermas," 229.
Ritual: helped by Gnostics, 194; stimulated by Manichæism, 197; at beginning of fourth century, 296; causes of development of, 296.
Ritual, of the Albigenses, 548.
"Robber Synod, The," referred to, 346.
Robert Grossetête, work and influence of, 601, 602.
Robertson, mentioned, 16.
Rokycana, referred to, 594, 595, 596, 598.
Roman Catholic Church: its early beginnings, 155; effect of Leo's letter upon, 346; historians of, 16; mediæval opposition to, classified, 543, *seq.;* attitude of Marsilius of Padua toward, 585, 586; attitude of Chelcicky toward, 588; Lollards' attitude toward, 590, 591; Waldensian attitude toward, 576, 577.
Roman Catholicism: triumphant in the West, 427, 428; how affected by feudalism, 445, *seq.;* the Curia in, 449–451; effect of Crusades upon, 461, *seq.* (See also Papacy.)
Roman Church: prevailingly Gentile in Paul's time, 102; prestige of, in second century, 252, 255; its primacy first advocated by Cyprian, 266, 267; history of its supremacy as *Cathedra Petri*, 267, 268.
Roman Empire: prepares the way for the spread of Christianity, 32, 33; early political contact of the Jews with, 55, 56; protects Jews of the Dispersion, 55; how regarded in the Apocalypse, 121, 122; attitude of, toward secret societies, 128; suspects Christianity, 149; shows signs of decay, 164; Persians invade, 350, 351.
Roman law, its influence on Tertullian, 257.
Roman officials: protect Paul, 103; protect early Christians, 111.
Roman religion: pantheistic, 29; its effects on the people, 29; place of priests in, 29, 30; threatened by Christianity and rallies for defense, 104, 165.
Romans: contrasted with the Greeks, 29; their views of religion, 29; influenced by conquered Greeks, 30; their policy concerning religions of conquered peoples, 30, 31.
Romans, Epistle to: discussed, 102; 13 : 1–7, explained, 112; 16, is it displaced? 102.
Rome: cosmopolitan, 28; its task, 33; Jews in, 56; Paul's work in, 104, 105; Peter in, 107; conflagration at, 113; ecclesiastical organization of, 449; growing power of church in, 398, *seq.*
Roscellinus, scholastic theologian, 477, *seq.*
Rothe, mentioned, 15.
Rufinus: referred to, 13; translates Origen, 283; attitude toward Origen, 333, 334.
Ruysbroek, John, referred to, 490, 617, 618.

Sabbath, attitude of Christians toward, 141.
Sabellius, 201, 256, 257.
Sacerdotalism: no support for in N. T., 129; stimulated by Manichæism, 197; helped by Clement of Alexandria, 279; at beginning of fourth century, 292.
Sadducees: aristocrats and free-thinkers, 49, 50; regard Jesus as a fanatic, 75, 76.
Sadduceeism, outlined, 47, 48.
Sagaris, martyrdom of, 158.
Salerno, University of, 470.
Samaria, a fruitful soil for Christian heresy, 55.
Samaritan Pentateuch, referred to, 54.
Samaritans, referred to, 54, 55.
Sanhedrin: rise of, 47; in individual synagogues, 127.
Saracens, the, Christians attack, 457.
Sassanides, referred to, 195.
Saturninus, mentioned, 186.
Saul. (See Paul.)
Savonarola, short sketch of, 619.
Saviour: pre-Christian history shows need of, 29; expected by Zoroastrians, 37.
Schaff, mentioned, 16.
Scholasticism, outlined, 474, *seq.*, 480, *seq.*
Scotus Erigena, sketch of, 475.
Scribes, their origin, 39.
Scriptures: great principles of, exemplified by church history, 18; Diocletian orders their destruction, 168 169; Symmachus translates, into Greek, 177 (see also Septuagint); Gnostic use of, 181, 182; Athenagoras converted by study of, 246; polemical writers accord proper place to,

247, 248; reading of, at beginning of fourth century, 294; their place in first to third century, 300; translated into Gothic, 331; Wycliffe translates, into English, 605. (See also New Testament and Old Testament.)
Secret societies: relation of, to Roman government, 128; formally proscribed by Trajan, 151; law against, enforced by Pliny, 152.
Sects: Jewish, development of, 47; Christian, 174, *seq.*
Secundus, mentioned, 209.
Sejanus, enemy of Jews, 56.
Seleucidæ, oppress the Jews, 40.
Seleucus IV., referred to, 45.
Semi-Arians: their views, 329; defend Origen, 332, 333.
Semi-Pelagian controversy, outlined, 359.
Semi-pelagians, history of, 369–371.
Septimius Severus: reign of, 160, 161; enforces Trajan's law, 160; persecutions under, 160.
Septuagint: discussed, 40, 41; significance of its popularity, 41; influence on the New Testament, 41.
Serfs, referred to, 444.
Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, and the Person of Christ, 352.
Sermon on the Mount, summary of, 74.
Severus, mentioned, 170.
Sheldon, referred to, 16.
"Shepherd of Hermas" discussed, 228–231.
Sibylline books, referred to, 44.
Sigismund, mentioned, 531.
Signature, of grace and of justice defined, 450.
Silvanus, mentioned, 111.
Simon, the Canaanite, referred to, 110.
Simon Maccabæus, referred to, 46.
Simon Magus: in Acts, 87; in the "Clementines," 177, 178, 181; in Gnostic systems, 185.
Sin: Greek ideas of, 21; Philo's view [illegible] in "Clementines," 178; Gnostic view of, 181; classified by Montanists, 205, 206; post-baptismal, according to Hermas, 230, 231; Tertullian's view of, 261, 262; post-baptismal, according to Tertullian, 263; history of theology of, before Pelagius, 359, *seq.*; Pelagian view of, 364; Augustine's views of, 366.
Sixtus: bishop of Rome, 167: "Sentences" of, 237.
Sixtus IV., mentioned, 537.
Skepticism, prevalent among the educated, 31.
Smith, mentioned, 16.
Socrates, his place in philosophy and his views, 22; writer of church history, 13.
"Solomon, Wisdom of," mentioned, 42; "Psalter of," mentioned, 43.
Song of the three children, 41.
Sorbonne, the, referred to, 472.
Sophronius, the monk, referred to, 351.
Soteriology: of Mani, 196; of Clement, 218; of Justin, 245; of Irenæus, 251, 252; of Clement of Alexandria, 278, 279; of Origen, 285.
Sozomen, mentioned, 13.
Spenta Armaita, mentioned, 36.
Spirituales, the, sketch of, 553, *seq.*
Sraosha, mentioned, 37.
Stalker, on character and influence of Jesus, 78–80.
State Church: Constantine's attitude toward, 307, 308; Theodosius' part in founding, 310, 311; advantages and disadvantages of, 311, *seq.*; imperial attitude toward, 395, 396; under the Carlovingians, 408.
State religion: Domitian's zeal for, 120; regarded as a political necessity, 156.
Stephen, referred to, 85, 86.
Stephen Langton, mentioned, 514.
Stoicism: its place in philosophy, 25, 26; its doctrines, 26; its likeness to Christianity, 26: influence of, on Christian thought and character, 26; its influence on Roman thinkers and Roman law, 31; never generally popular, 31; influence of, on Philo, 60, 61; influence of, on Tertullian, 257, 261, 262.
St. Peter's, when built, 535.
Sulpicius Severus: mentioned, 13, 371; helps Vigilantius, 377.
Sunday. (See Lord's Day.)
Sun-worship: among the Essenes, 53; of Heliogabalus, 161.
Supralapsarianism, Augustine's relation to, 367.
Suso, Henry, his position among the mystics, 489, 490.
Symmachus, mentioned, 177, 401, 402.
Synagogue: rise of, 38; the great, 38, 39; organization of, 127, 128; relation of to Christianity, 127.
Synod, rise of, 294.
Syria, many Jews there, 56.
Systematic theology, first work on, 282, 283.

Taborites: sketch of, 581, *seq.*; doctrines of, 582–584; mentioned, 617.
Tacitus, describes persecution of Christians, 113, 114.
Talmud, referred to, 47.
Tanchelm, sketch of, 567.
Targums: mentioned, 47; the Word in, 61.
Tatian, mentioned, 186, 237, 245, 246.
Tauler, John, views of, 489, *seq.*
Teachers, in New Testament, 133.
"Teaching of the Twelve Apostles": date, authenticity, etc., 233–237; relation to "Ecclesiastical Constitutions," 289.
Telesphorus, mentioned, 154.
Templars, the: mentioned, 455; destroyed, 524.
Temple of Jerusalem, destroyed by Titus, 117.

Temptation of Jesus: its significance, 70; when related to the disciples, 70.
Tertullian: attitude toward Praxeas, 201; life, works, etc., of, 257, *seq.;* contrasted with Clement of Alexandria, 279, 280; influence of, on Cyprian, 265.
Teutonic Knights, the, mentioned, 455.
Teutonic peoples, the, relation of, to Christianity, 437.
Thaddeus, referred to, 110.
Theodore, bishop of Rome, repudiates Monothelitism, 353.
Theodore of Mopsuestia: Christology of, 336; condemned, 349.
Theodoret: mentioned, 13; defends Nestorianism, 340; opposes Monophysitism, 343; opposes Eutyches, 344; excluded from "Robber Synod," 346; vindicated, 349.
Theodorus, mentioned, 13.
Theodosius the Great, referred to, 310, 311.
Theodosius II., attitude of, toward Cyril, 340.
Theodotus, referred to, 197, 198.
Theology in Middle Ages, 474.
Theophilus, referred to, 237, 246; attitude of, toward Origen, 334.
Theosophy of India, encouraged at Alexandria, 28.
Thessalonians, Epistle to, discussed, 97.
Thessalonica, Paul's work at, 97.
Thomas, mentioned, 110.
Thomas a Kempis, referred to, 490.
Thomas Aquinas, sketch of, 483.
Thomas of Stitney, mentioned, 612.
Thraseas, martyrdom of, 158.
"Three Chapters," fate of, 349.
Tiberius, allows Jews to return, 56.
Tillemont, mentioned, 14.
Timothy: chosen by Paul, 96; 1 Ep. to, 106; 2 Ep. to, 106; 1 Tim. 3 : 15, 125.
Tishtrya, referred to, 37.
Titus, mentioned, 117.
Tobit, referred to, 42.
Tradition, its place among the Pharisees, 48.
Traditors, referred to, 169, 208.
Traducianism, Tertullian its first advocate, 262, 359, 360.
Trajan: referred to, 151; correspondence with Pliny, 151; policy *re* Christians, 152.
Transubstantiation, defined for the first time, 515.
Trinity: in "1 Clement," 218; Neander's view of, 251; Tertullian's view of, 260, 261.
Troas, Paul at, 102.
"Two Ways, The": in "Barnabas," 221; in "Teaching of the Twelve," 234; in "Ecclesiastical Constitutions," 289.
"Typos, The," of the Emperor Heraclius, 352.

Uhlhorn, on Roman government and Christianity, 33.
Ulfilas, referred to, 331.
Ulpian, referred to, 163.
"*Unam Sanctam*," bull of, 522.
Unitas Fratrum explained, 594.
Unity, Christian: promoted by studying church history, 18; Cyprian's view of its importance, 270, 271.
Universities: of Middle Ages, 469, *seq.;* origin of the name, 470.
Urban II., his relation to the Crusades, 458.

Valentinus: referred to, 188, 189; his views attacked by Irenæus, 249.
Valeria, referred to, 168.
Valerian, referred to, 166, 167.
Vatican, palace and library, when built, 535.
Verethraghna, referred to, 37.
Vespasian: besieges Jerusalem, 117; policy toward Christians and Jews, 119, 120.
"Vicar of God," when the term was first used, 513.
Victor of Rome: attitude toward Praxeas, 201; attitude regarding the Easter controversy, 252; his disposition, 255.
Vienne, persecution at, 157.
Vigilantian controversy, mentioned, 377, *seq.*
Vigilantius, sketch of, 377, *seq.*
Vigilantius, survival of his doctrine, 559.
Vigilius, mentioned, 403, 404.
Vincentius of Lerins, mentioned, 370.
"Virgins, Epistles to," referred to, 218.
Vohu Manah, referred to, 36.

Waldenses, the, sketch of, 569, *seq.*
Waldo, Peter, sketch of, 570, 571.
Water, its sanctity extolled by Tertullian, 262, 263.
Wendt, on character and [illegible] of Jesus, 79.
West of Europe: at close of eighth century, 423, *seq.;* compared with the last, 424, *seq.*
Will: Justin's view of, 244; Irenæus' view of, 251; Tertullian's view of, 261; Clement of Alexandria's view of, 278, 279; history of theology of, before Pelagius, 359, *seq.;* Pelagian view of, 363, *seq.;* Augustine's views of, 365, 366. (See also Free Will.)
William of Champeaux, referred to, 477.
Willibrord, sketch of, 410, *seq.*
Winifrid. (See Boniface.)
"Wisdom of Solomon," mentioned, 42.
Works, of merit, among Christians at beginning of fourth century, 292.
Worldliness: its presence in the churches, 165; in the churches at end of third century, 167; Montanist protest against, 206; of Christians in time of Tertullian, 264; of

Christians, gives rise to monasticism, 317.
Worldly power, its relation to Christian growth, 148.
Worms, Concordat of, 510.
Worship: in early churches, 140–142; places for, among early Christians, 142; of relics, 209; in Justin Martyr's writings, 245; at beginning of fourth century, 292, 295; was influenced by union of Church and State, 313, 314.
Wycliffe: influences Taborites, 581; his plan of reformation, 604. *seq.;* his doctrinal views, 606, *seq.;* proceedings against, 607; influence of his writings in Bohemia, 613, 614.
Wycliffite movement, the, sketch of, 600, *seq.*

Yazatas, referred to, 37.

Zahn, his view of the "Ignatian Epistles" discussed, 223–226.
Zealots, Jewish, in the wars with Rome A. D. 70 onward, 117, *seq.*
Zenobia, referred to, 198.
Zenos, on the mode of baptism, 187.
Zephyrinus, mentioned, 201, 255, 256.
Ziska, John, mentioned, 582.
Zoroastrianism: at Alexandria, 28; outline of, 36, 37; relation to Essenism, 53, 54; relation to Gnosticism, 182; revival of, 195.
Zosimus, attitude of toward Pelagians, 368.

Date Due

NOV 21 '53	FEB 21		
OCT 29 '53			
JAN 25 '54			
JAN 7 '58			
JAN 30 '58			
SEP 29			
OCT 4			
SEP 30			
OCT 22			
NOV 17			
DEC 13			
MAY 18			
MAY 27			
OCT 12			
FEB 22			
MAR 9			
OCT 26			
NOV 25 1977			
NOV 29 1979			

Library Bureau Cat. No. 1137

LEWAN LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER
DENVER SEMINARY
6399 SOUTH SANTA FE DRIVE
LITTLETON, CO 80120

LEWAN LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER
DENVER SEMINARY
6399 SOUTH SANTA FE DRIVE
LITTLETON, CO 80120

3170, v.I

270
N462M

BR
162
N6